arXiv:math/0108095v1 [math.AP] 13 Aug 2001

2000]Primary 35J70; Secondary 47A05, 58J05, 58J32

ADJOINTS OF ELLIPTIC CONE OPERATORS

JUAN B. GIL AND GERARDO A. MENDOZA

Abstract. We study the adjointness problem for the closed extensions of a general b-elliptic operator $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$, $\nu > 0$, initially defined as an unbounded operator $A : C_c^\infty(M;E) \subset x^\mu L_b^2(M;E) \to x^\mu L_b^2(M;E)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. The case where A is a symmetric semibounded operator is of particular interest, and we give a complete description of the domain of the Friedrichs extension of such an operator.

1. Introduction

Let M_0 be a smooth paracompact manifold, $\mathfrak{m}$ a smooth positive measure on M_0. Suppose $A : C_c^\infty(M_0) \to C_c^\infty(M_0)$ is a scalar linear partial differential operator with smooth coefficients. Among all possible domains $\mathcal{D} \subset L^2(M_0, \mathfrak{m})$ for A as an unbounded operator on $L^2(M_0)$ there are two that stand out:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) = \{u \in L^2(M_0,\mathfrak{m}) \mid Au \in L^2(M_0,\mathfrak{m})\}$$

where Au is computed in the distributional sense, and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \text{ completion of } C_c^\infty(M_0) \text{ with respect to the norm } \|u\| + \|Au\|,$$

which can be regarded as a subspace of $L^2(M_0,\mathfrak{m})$. Both domains are dense in $L^2(M_0,\mathfrak{m})$, since $C_c^\infty(M_0) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$, and with each domain A is a closed operator. Clearly $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ is the smallest domain containing $C_c^\infty(M_0)$ with respect to which A is closed, and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ contains any domain on which the action of the operator coincides with the action of A in the distributional sense. Also clearly, A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ is an extension of A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$.

If M_0 is compact without boundary and A is elliptic then $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$; the interesting situations occur when A is non-elliptic or M_0 is noncompact. In this paper we shall analyze the latter problem, assuming that M_0 is the interior of a smooth compact manifold M with boundary and that $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$, $\nu > 0$, is a b-elliptic 'cone' operator acting on sections of a smooth vector bundle $E \to M$; here $x : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth defining function for ∂M, positive in M_0.

The elements of $\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ are the totally characteristic differential operators introduced and analyzed systematically by Melrose [8]. These are linear operators with smooth coefficients which near the boundary can be written in local coordinates $(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ as $P = \sum_{k+|\alpha|\le m} a_{k\alpha}(xD_x)^k D_y^\alpha$. Such an operator is b-elliptic if it is elliptic in the interior in the usual sense and in addition $\sum_{k+|\alpha|=m} a_{k\alpha}(0,y)\xi^k\eta^\alpha$ is invertible for $(\xi,\eta) \neq 0$; this is expressed more concisely by saying that the principal symbol of P, as an object on the compressed cotangent bundle (see Melrose, op.cit.), is an isomorphism. It follows from the definition of b-ellipiticity that the family of differential operators on ∂M given locally by $\hat{P}_0(\sigma) = \sum_{j+|\alpha|\le m} a_{\alpha,j}(0,y)\sigma^j D_y^\alpha$, called the indicial operator or conormal symbol

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* [.

Key words and phrases. b-calculus, cone algebra, selfadjointness, Friedrichs extension.

of P, is elliptic of order m for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$. For the general theory of these operators and the associated pseudodifferential calculus the reader is referred to the paper of Melrose cited above, his book [9], as well as Schulze [14, 15]. An operator $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ is b-elliptic if $P = x^\nu A$ is b-elliptic. By definition the conormal symbol of A is that of P. For more details see Section 2.

The measure used to define the L^2 spaces will be of the form $x^\mu\mathfrak{m}$ for some real μ, where $\mathfrak{m}$ is a b-density, that is, $x\mathfrak{m}$ is a smooth positive density. The spaces $L^2(M;E;x^\mu\mathfrak{m})$ are defined in the usual way with the aid of a smooth but otherwise arbitrary hermitian metric on E. These spaces are related among themselves by canonical isometries with which $L^2(M;E;x^\mu\mathfrak{m}) = x^{-\mu/2}L^2_b(M,E)$, where $L^2_b(M,E)$ is the space defined by the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ itself.

This said, the general problem we are concerned with is the description of the adjoints of the closed extensions of a general b-elliptic operator $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ initially defined as an unbounded operator

$$A : C^\infty_c(M;E) \subset x^\mu L^2_b(M;E) \to x^\mu L^2_b(M;E). \tag{1.1}$$

The case where A is a symmetric semibounded operator is of particular interest, and we give, in Theorem 8.12, a complete description of the domain of the Friedrichs extension of such an operator.

Differential operators in $x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ arise in the study of manifolds with conical singularities. The study of such manifolds from the geometric point of view began with Cheeger [3], and by now there is an extensive literature on the subject. In the specific context of our work, probably the most relevant references, aside from those cited above, are the book by Lesch [7], and the papers by Brüning and Seeley [1, 2], and Mooers [11]. See also Coriasco, Schrohe, and Seiler [13].

As already mentioned, the domains $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ need not be the same. The object determining the closed extensions of A is its conormal symbol $\hat{P}_0(\sigma) : C^\infty(\partial M) \to C^\infty(\partial M)$. Because of the b-ellipticity, this operator is invertible for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$ except a discrete set $\operatorname{spec}_b(A)$, the boundary spectrum of A (or P), a set which (again due to the b-ellipticity) intersects any strip $a < \Im\sigma < b$ in a finite set. It was noted by Lesch [7] that $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ if and only if $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{-\mu - \nu < \Im\sigma < -\mu\} = \varnothing$. Also proved by Lesch [op.cit., Proposition 1.3.16] was the fact that $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ is finite dimensional. This provides a simple description of the closed extensions of A: they are given by the operator A acting in the distributional sense on subspaces $\mathcal{D} \subset x^\mu L^2_b(M;E)$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \subset \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$. These results and others, also due to Lesch (op.cit.) are reproved in Section 3 for the sake of completeness, with a slightly different approach emphasizing the use of the pseudodifferential calculus, for totally characteristic operators [10], or for the cone algebra [14]. In that section we also prove a relative index theorem for the closed extensions of A.

From the point of view of closed extensions there is nothing more to understand than that they are in one to one correspondence with the subspaces of $\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$. The problem of finding the domain of the adjoint is more delicate, and forces us to pass to the Mellin transforms of representatives of elements of $\mathcal{E}$. Our approach entails rewriting the pairing $[u,v]_A = (Au,v) - (u,A^\star v)$, defined for $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$, where $A^\star$ is the formal adjoint of A, in terms of the Mellin transforms of u and v, and proving certain specific nondegeneracy properties of the pairing. It is generally true (and well known) that in a general abstract setting, $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ induces a nonsingular pairing of $\mathcal{E}(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}(A^\star)$. In the case at hand, there is an essentially well defined notion of an element $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ with pole 'only' at $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{-\mu - \nu < \Im\sigma < -\mu\}$. If $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ then $\overline{\sigma}_0 - i(\nu + 2\mu) \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A^\star)$, and we show, for example, that the restriction of the pairing to elements $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ with pole 'only' at σ_0 and elements v in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ with pole 'only' at $\overline{\sigma}_0 - i(\nu + 2\mu)$ is nonsingular (modulo the respective minimal domains).

Our analysis of the pairing begins in Section 5 with a careful description of the Mellin transforms of elements in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$. The main result in that section is Proposition 5.9, a result along the lines of part of the work of Gohberg and Sigal [4]. In Section 6 we prove in a somewhat abstract setting that the pairing alluded to above for solutions with poles at conjugate points is nonsingular (Theorem 6.4). In Section 7 we link the pairing $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ with the pairing of Section 6. The main results are Theorems 7.11 and 7.17. The first of these gives a formula for the pairing which in particular shows that the pairing is null when the poles in question are not conjugate, and the second, which is based on the formula in Theorem 7.11 and Theorem 6.4, shows that the pairing of elements associated to conjugate poles is nonsingular. The formulas are explicit enough that in simple cases it is easy to determine the domain of the adjoint of a given extension of A.

We undertake the study of the domain of the Friedrichs extension of b-elliptic semibounded operators in Section 8. The main result there is Theorem 8.12, which is a complete description of the domain of the Friedrichs extension. Loosely speaking, the domain consists of the sum of those elements $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ with poles 'only' in $-\mu-\nu < \Im\sigma < -\mu-\nu/2$ and those with pole 'only' at $\Im\sigma = -\mu-\nu/2$ and 'half' of the order of the pole. Finally, in Section 9 we collect a number of examples that illustrate the use of Theorems 7.11, 7.17, and 8.12.

Any closed extension of a b-elliptic operator $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ as an operator $\mathcal{D} \subset x^\mu L^2_b(M;E) \to x^\mu L^2_b(M;E)$ has the space $x^{\mu+\nu}H^m_b(M;E)$ in its domain. The space $H^m_b(M;E)$ is the subspace of $L^2_b(M;E)$ whose elements u are such that for any smooth vector fields $V_1,\dots,V_k$, $k \le m$, on M tangent to the boundary, $V_1 \dots V_k u \in L^2_b(M;E)$. Other than this, the set of domains of the closed extensions of different b-elliptic operators in $x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ are generally not equal. In Section 4 we provide simple sufficient conditions for the domains of two such operators to be the same. Not unexpectedly, these conditions are on the equality of Taylor expansion at the boundary of the operators involved, up to an order depending on ν. We prove in particular that under the appropriate condition the domains of the Friedrichs extensions of two different symmetric semibounded operators are the same. This is used in Section 8 as an intermediate step to determine the domain of the Friedrichs extension of such an operator, and a refinement of the condition is obtained as a consequence.

Operators of the kind we investigate arise naturally as geometric operators. In such applications μ is determined by the actual situation. It is convenient for us, however, to work with the normalization

$$x^{-\mu-\nu/2}Ax^{\mu+\nu/2} : C^\infty_c(M;E) \subset x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E).$$

rather than (1.1). Since the mappings $x^s : x^\mu L^2_b(M;E) \to x^{\mu+s}L^2_b(M;E)$ are surjective isometries, this represents no loss. In particular, adjoints and symmetry properties of operators are preserved. Also to be noted is that these transformations represent translations on the Mellin transform side, so it is a simple exercise to recast information presented in terms of Mellin transforms of the modified operator as information on the original operator.

2. Geometric preliminaries

Throughout the paper M is a compact manifold with (nonempty) boundary with a fixed positive b-density $\mathfrak{m}$, that is, a smooth density $\mathfrak{m}$ such that for some (hence any) defining function x, $x\mathfrak{m}$ is a smooth positive density. We will also fix a hermitian vector bundle $E \to M$.

Fix a collar neighborhood U_Y for each boundary component Y of M, so we have a trivial fiber bundle $\pi_Y : U_Y \to Y$ with fiber $[0,1)$. We can then canonically identify the bundle of 1-densities over U_Y with $|\bigwedge|[0,1) \otimes |\bigwedge|Y$ (the tensor product of the pullback to $[0,1) \times Y$ of the respective density bundles).

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a b-density on $|\bigwedge|[0,1) \otimes |\bigwedge|Y$. Then there is a smooth defining function $x : Y \times [0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ vanishing at $Y \times 0$, and a smooth density $\mathfrak{m}_Y$ on Y, such that

$$\mathfrak{m} = \frac{dx}{x} \otimes \mathfrak{m}_Y$$

Indeed, let ξ be the variable in $[0,1)$. Over the boundary of $[0,1) \times Y$ we then get, canonically, $\xi\mathfrak{m} = d\xi \otimes \mathfrak{m}_Y$. Then, on $[0,1) \times Y$, $\mathfrak{m} = h\frac{d\xi}{\xi} \otimes \mathfrak{m}_Y$ with h smooth, positive, $h(0,y) = 1$. Let $x = g\xi$ where g is determined modulo constant factor by the requirement that $\frac{d_\xi x}{x} = h\frac{d_\xi \xi}{\xi}$ (d_ξ means differential in the variable ξ; this makes sense since we are dealing with a product manifold). Thus $g(\xi, y)$ should satisfy the equation

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi} + \frac{1-h}{\xi} g = 0$$

Since $h = 1$ when $\xi = 0$, the solutions g are smooth across $\xi = 0$. Pick the one which is 1 when $\xi = 0$.

We fix the choice of x for each boundary component. When working near the boundary we will always assume that the defining function was chosen above, and that the coordinates, if at all necessary, are consistent with a choice of product structure as above. By ∂_x we mean the vector field tangent to the fibers of $U_Y \to Y$ such that $\partial_x x = 1$.

If E, $F \to M$ are (smooth) vector bundles and $P \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M; E, F)$ is a b-elliptic differential operator, then E and F are isomorphic. This follows from the fact that the principal symbol of P is an isomorphism $\pi^*E \to \pi^*F$ where $\pi : {}^bT^*M\backslash 0 \to M$ is the projection, and the fact that the compressed cotangent bundle ${}^bT^*M$ admits a global nonvanishing section (since it is isomorphic to T^*M and M is a manifold with boundary). Thus when analyzing b-elliptic operators in $\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M; E, F)$ we may assume $F = E$ (for more on this see [6]).

The Hilbert space structure of the space of sections of $E \to M$ is the usual one, namely integration with respect to $\mathfrak{m}$ of the pointwise inner product in E:

$$(u, v)_{L^2_b(M;E)} = \int (u, v)_E \, \mathfrak{m} \quad \text{if } u,\ v \in L^2_b(M; E).$$

Fix a hermitian connection ∇ on E. If $P \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$, then near a boundary component one can write

$$P = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} P_\ell \circ (\nabla_{xD_x})^\ell$$

where the P_ℓ are differential operators of order $m-\ell$ (defined on U_Y) such that for any smooth function $\phi(x)$ and section u of E over U_Y, $P_\ell(\phi(x)u) = \phi(x)P_\ell(u)$, in other words, of order zero in ∇_{xD_x}. P is said to have coefficients independent of x near Y if $\nabla_{\partial_x} P_k(u) = P_k(\nabla_{\partial_x} u)$ for any smooth section u of E supported in U_Y. By means of parallel transport along the fibers of $U_Y \to Y$ one can show that if $P \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$, then for any N there are operators P_k, $\tilde P_N \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ such that

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{N} P_k x^k + \tilde P_N x^N$$

where P_k has coefficients independent of x near Y. If P_k has coefficients independent of x near Y then so does its formal adjoint $P_k^\star$. To see this recall that since the connection is hermitian, $\partial_x(u,v)_E = (\nabla_{\partial_x} u, v) + (u, \nabla_{\partial_x} v)$ if u and v are supported near Y, so if they vanish on Y then

$$(\nabla_{\partial_x} u, v)_{L^2_b(M;E)} = -(u, \nabla_{\partial_x} v)_{L^2_b(M;E)}.$$

One derives the assertion easily from this.

Fix $\omega \in C_c^\infty(-1,1)$ real valued, nonnegative and such that $\omega = 1$ in a neighborhood of 0. The Mellin transform of a section of $C_c^\infty(\overset{\circ}{M};E)$ is defined to be the entire function $\hat u : \mathbb{C} \to C^\infty(Y;E)$ such that for any $v \in C^\infty(Y;E|_Y)$

$$(x^{-i\sigma}\omega(x)u, \pi_Y^* v)_{L^2_b(M;E)} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=0} (\hat u(\sigma,y), v(y))_{L^2(Y;E|_Y)}\, d\sigma \tag{2.1}$$

By $\pi_Y^* v$ we mean the section of E over U_Y obtained by parallel transport of v along the fibers of π_Y. Thus if $u \in C^\infty(U_Y;E)$ is such that $\nabla_{\partial_x} u = 0$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(0,1)$, then

$$\widehat{\phi u}(\sigma) = \widehat{\omega\phi}(\sigma)\, u$$

where $\widehat{\omega\phi}(\sigma)$ is the "usual" Mellin transform of $\omega\phi$. The only point here is that we incorporate the cut-off function into the definition. As is well known, the Mellin transform extends to the spaces $x^\mu L^2_b(M,E)$ in such a way that if $u \in x^\mu L^2_b(M,E)$ then $\hat u(\sigma)$ is holomorphic in $\{\Im\sigma > -\mu\}$ and in $L^2(\{\Im\sigma = -\mu\} \times Y)$ with respect to $d\sigma \otimes \mathfrak{m}_Y$.

The conormal symbol $\hat P_0$ of $P \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M)$ is the operator valued polynomial defined by

$$\hat P_0(\sigma)(u) = x^{-i\sigma} P(x^{i\sigma}\pi_Y^* u)|_Y, \quad u \in C^\infty(Y;E_Y), \sigma \in \mathbb{C}.$$

It is easy to prove that $\widehat{P_0^\star}(\sigma) = (\hat P_0(\overline{\sigma}))^*$.

3. Closed extensions

Recall first the abstract situation (cf. [12]), where $A : \mathcal{D}_{\max} \subset H \to H$ is a densely defined closed operator in a Hilbert space H. Thus $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ is complete with the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_A$ induced by the inner product $(u,v) + (Au,Av)$, and if $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ is a subspace, then $A : \mathcal{D} \subset H \to H$ is a closed operator if and only if $\mathcal{D}$

is closed with respect to $\|\cdot\|_A$. Fix $\mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}$, suppose $\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ is dense in H and closed with respect to $\|\cdot\|_A$. Let

$$\mathfrak{D} = \{\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \mathcal{D} \text{ is closed w.r.t. } \|\cdot\|_A\} \tag{3.1}$$

Thus $\mathfrak{D}$ is in one to one correspondence with the set of closed operators $A : \mathcal{D} \subset H \to H$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}$. For our purposes the following restatement is more appropriate.

Proposition 3.2. *The set $\mathfrak{D}$ is in one to one correspondence with the set of closed subspaces of the quotient*

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D}_{\max}/\mathcal{D}_{\min} \tag{3.3}$$

In our concrete case $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M; E)$, $\nu > 0$, is a b-elliptic cone operator, considered initially as a densely defined unbounded operator

$$A : C^\infty_c(M; E) \subset x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E) \to x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E). \tag{3.4}$$

We take $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ as the closure of (3.4) with respect to the graph norm, and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) = \{u \in x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E) \,|\, Au \in x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)\},$$

which is also the domain of the Hilbert space adjoint of

$$A^\star : \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A^\star) \subset x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E) \to x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E).$$

Thus $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ is the largest subspace of $x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$ on which A acts in the distributional sense and produces an element of $x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$; one can define A on any subspace of $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ by restriction. These definitions have nothing to do with ellipticity. The following almost tautological lemma is based on the continuity of $A : x^{\nu/2} H^m_b(M; E) \to x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$ and the fact that $C^\infty_c(\overset{\circ}{M}; E)$ is dense in $x^{\nu/2} H^m_b(M; E)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $A \in x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$, let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ be such that $A : \mathcal{D} \subset x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E) \to x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$ is closed. If $\mathcal{D}$ contains $x^{\nu/2} H^m_b(M; E)$ then $\mathcal{D}$ contains $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$. In particular, $x^{\nu/2} H^m_b(M; E) \subset D_{\min}(A)$.*

Adding the b-ellipticity of A as a hypothesis provides the following precise characterization of $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$:

Proposition 3.6. *If $A \in x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M; E)$ is b-elliptic, then*

1. $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} x^{\nu/2 - \varepsilon} H^m_b(M; E)\right)$
2. $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = x^{\nu/2} H^m_b(M; E)$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2\} = \varnothing$.

The proof requires a number of ingredients, beginning with the following fundamental result [10], [14]:

Theorem 3.7. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M; E)$ be b-elliptic. For every real s and γ,*

$$A : x^\gamma H^s_b(M; E) \to x^{\gamma - \nu} H^{s-m}_b(M; E)$$

is Fredholm if and only if $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\gamma\} = \varnothing$. In this case, one can find a bounded pseudodifferential parametrix

$$Q : x^{\gamma - \nu} H^{s-m}_b(M; E) \to x^\gamma H^s_b(M; E)$$

such that $R = QA - 1$ and $\tilde{R} = AQ - 1$ are smoothing cone operators.

Note that if A is b-elliptic we always can find an operator Q such that

$$\begin{gathered} QA-1 : x^{\gamma}H_b^s(M;E) \to x^{\gamma}H_b^{\infty}(M;E) \ \text{ and} \\ AQ-1 : x^{\gamma-\nu}H_b^s(M;E) \to x^{\gamma-\nu}H_b^{\infty}(M;E) \end{gathered}$$

are bounded for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, even if the boundary spectrum intersects the line $\{\Im\sigma = -\gamma\}$. Also in this case $\ker A$ and $\ker A^\star$ are finite dimensional spaces. Moreover, for every $u \in x^{\gamma}H_b^s(M;E)$,

$$\|u\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} \le \|(QA-1)u\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} + \|QAu\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s},$$

which implies

$$\|u\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} \le C_{s,\gamma}\Big(\|u\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} + \|Au\|_{x^{\gamma-\nu}H_b^{s-m}}\Big) \tag{3.8}$$

for some constant $C_{s,\gamma} > 0$.

As noted above, there is a bounded operator $Q : x^{\gamma-\nu}H_b^{s-m} \to x^{\gamma}H_b^s$ such that $R = QA-1 : x^{\gamma}H_b^{s-m} \to x^{\gamma}H_b^{\infty}$ is bounded. Hence for $u \in x^{\gamma}H_b^s$

$$\|u\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} \le \|Ru\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s} + \|QAu\|_{x^\gamma H_b^s},$$

which implies the estimate (3.8).

Lemma 3.9. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \hookrightarrow x^{-\nu/2+\varepsilon}H_b^m(M;E).$$

Proof. The inclusion follows from (3.8) and the fact that, if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ then $\hat{u}$ has no poles on $\{\Im\sigma = \nu/2\}$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller than the distance between $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma < \nu/2\}$ and the line $\{\Im\sigma = \nu/2\}$. The continuity of the embedding is a consequence of the closed graph theorem since $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $x^{-\nu/2+\varepsilon}H_b^m$ are both continuously embedded in $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. □

Recall that $x^{-\nu/2+\varepsilon}H_b^m(M;E)$ is compactly embedded in $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$. Hence if A with domain $\mathcal{D}$ is closed, then

$$(\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_A) \hookrightarrow x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) \ \text{ compactly.} \tag{3.10}$$

That this embedding is compact is a fundamental difference between the situation at hand and b-elliptic totally characteristic operators and is due to the presence of the factor $x^{-\nu}$ in A.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\gamma \in [-\nu/2, \nu/2]$ be such that $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\gamma\} = \varnothing$. Then A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap x^{\gamma}H_b^m(M;E)$ is a closed operator on $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$.*

Proof. Let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap x^{\gamma}H_b^m$ with $u_n \to u$ and $Au_n \to f$ in $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. Further, let Q be a parametrix of A as in Theorem 3.7. In particular,

$$QA = 1 + R : x^{\gamma}H_b^m(M;E) \to x^{\gamma}H_b^m(M;E) \text{ is Fredholm.}$$

So, $Au_n \to f$ implies $(1+R)u_n \to Qf$ in $x^{\gamma}H_b^m$, and $Qf = (1+R)\tilde{u}$ for some $\tilde{u} \in x^{\gamma}H_b^m$. Now, since $\dim\ker(1+R) < \infty$, there is a closed subspace $H \subset x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ such that $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) = H \oplus \ker(1+R)$. If π_H denotes the orthogonal projection onto H, then $\pi_H u_n \to \pi_H u$ in $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ and, as above,

$$(1+R)\pi_H u_n \to (1+R)\pi_H\tilde{u} \ \text{ in } x^{\gamma}H_b^m.$$

Thus $\pi_H u_n \to \pi_H\tilde{u}$ in $x^{\gamma}H_b^m \hookrightarrow x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ which implies that $\pi_H u = \pi_H\tilde{u} \in x^{\gamma}H_b^m$.

On the other hand, $(1-\pi_H)u_n \to (1-\pi_H)u \in \ker(1+R) \subset x^\gamma H_b^m$. Therefore, $u \in x^\gamma H_b^m$ and $Au = f$. In other words, A with the given domain is closed. ☐

Momentarily returning to the abstract situation of a densely defined closed operator $A : \mathcal{D}_{\max} \subset H \to H$, let $\mathcal{D}^\star_{\min}$ be the domain of its adjoint. Further, let $\mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$ be the domain of the adjoint of $A : \mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset H \to H$, and denote this adjoint by $A^\star$. Then we have $\mathcal{D}^\star_{\min} \subset \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$.

Let $\mathfrak{D}^\star$ and $\mathcal{E}^\star$ be the analogues of (3.1) and (3.3) for $A^\star$. Define

$$[\cdot,\cdot]_A : \mathcal{D}_{\max} \times \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max} \to \mathbb{C}$$

by

$$[u,v]_A = (Au,v) - (u,A^\star v). \tag{3.12}$$

Then $[u,v]_A = 0$ if either $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}$ or $v \in \mathcal{D}^\star_{\min}$, and $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ induces a nondegenerate pairing

$$[\cdot,\cdot]_A^\flat : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}^\star \to \mathbb{C}.$$

Indeed, suppose $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ is such that $[u,v]_A = 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$. Then $(Au,v) = (u,A^\star v)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$, which implies that u belongs to the domain of the adjoint of $A^\star : \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max} \subset H \to H$, that is, $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}$. Thus the class of u in $\mathcal{E}$ is zero. Likewise, if $v \in \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$ and $[u,v]_A = 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ then $v \in \mathcal{D}^\star_{\min}$.

Given $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$, let $\mathcal{D}^\perp \subset \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$ be the orthogonal of $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$. The adjoint A^* of $A : \mathcal{D} \subset H \to H$ is precisely the operator $A^\star$ restricted to $\mathcal{D}^\perp$. Consequently, A is selfadjoint if and only if $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^\perp$.*

Proof. Let $A^* : \mathcal{D}^* \subset H \to H$ be the adjoint of $A|_{\mathcal{D}}$. We have $(Au,v) = (u,A^\star v)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{D}$, $v \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$. Thus $\mathcal{D}^\perp \subset \mathcal{D}^*$ and $A^*v = A^\star v$ if $v \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{D}^* \subset \mathcal{D}^\star_{\max}$ (because $\mathcal{D} \supset \mathcal{D}_{\min}$), it makes sense to compute $[u,v]_A$ for $u \in \mathcal{D}$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}^*$. For such u, v we then have $[u,v]_A = 0$ since $A^*v = A^\star v$ for every $v \in \mathcal{D}^*$. Thus $\mathcal{D}^* \subset \mathcal{D}^\perp$ which completes the proof that $\mathcal{D}^* = \mathcal{D}^\perp$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 3.6. To prove part 1 we will show inclusion in both directions. If $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2 + \varepsilon\} = \varnothing$, then

$$x^{\nu/2} H_b^m(M;E) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max} \cap x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon} H_b^m(M;E),$$

so from Lemmas 3.5 and 3.11 we deduce $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon} H_b^m(M;E)$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap \bigcap_{\varepsilon>0} x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon} H_b^m(M;E).$$

To prove the reverse inclusion let $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max} \cap \bigcap_{\varepsilon>0} x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon} H_b^m$ and set $u_n = x^{1/n}u$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $x^{\nu/2} H_b^m$ and as $n \to \infty$

$$u_n \to u \text{ in } x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon} H_b^m, \text{ and } Au_n \to Au \text{ in } x^{-\nu/2-\varepsilon} L_b^2$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, $x^\varepsilon Au_n \to x^\varepsilon Au$ in $x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2$. Choose ε sufficiently small such that $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star) \subset x^{-\nu/2+\varepsilon} H_b^m$ (Lemma 3.9). Then for $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$

$$(Au_n, v) = (x^\varepsilon Au_n, x^{-\varepsilon} v) \to (x^\varepsilon Au, x^{-\varepsilon} v) = (Au, v) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

On the other hand, $(u_n, A^\star v) \to (u, A^\star v)$ and $(Au_n, v) = (u_n, A^\star v)$ since $u_n \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$. Hence $(Au,v) = (u, A^\star v)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$, that is, $[u,v]_A = 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ which implies $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ since $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)^\perp$.

To prove part 2, suppose first that $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2\} = \varnothing$. Then Lemma 3.11 gives that A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap x^{\nu/2}H_b^m(M;E)$ is closed. Since $x^{\nu/2}H_b^m(M;E) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$, Lemma 3.5 implies $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = x^{\nu/2}H_b^m(M;E)$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = x^{\nu/2}H_b^m(M;E)$, then A with domain $x^{\nu/2}H_b^m(M;E)$ is Fredholm, so by Theorem 3.7 $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2\} = \varnothing$ □

We will now prove that $\mathcal{D}_{\max}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ is finite dimensional. This is a consequence of the following proposition, which is interesting on its own, see Lesch [7, Lemma 1.3.15, Prop. 1.3.16].

Proposition 3.14. *If $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ is b-elliptic, every closed extension*

$$A : \mathcal{D} \subset x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$$

is a Fredholm operator. Moreover, $\dim \mathcal{D}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ is finite, and

$$\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}} = \operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_{\min}} + \dim \mathcal{D}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A).$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \textit{ is finite dimensional.}$$

Below we will give a proof different from that of Lesch. That the dimension of $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ is finite can also be proved by observing that if $A = x^{-\nu}P$ with $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ and $Au \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$, then $Pu \in x^{\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$, so the Mellin transform of Pu is holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$, from which it follows that $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ is meromorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$, and holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > \nu/2$ since $u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$ (see [5], also [10]). On the other hand, if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}$, then $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ is holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$. This type of argument leads to

Corollary 3.15. *If $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ is b-elliptic then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \textit{ if and only if } \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma \in (-\nu/2, \nu/2)\} = \varnothing.$$

We will analyze $\mathcal{E}(A)$ more carefully in the next sections. This will entail some repetition of work done by Gohberg and Sigal [4].

Our proof of Proposition 3.14 requires the following classical result [16]:

Lemma 3.16. *Let X, Y and Z be Banach spaces such that $X \hookrightarrow Y$ is compact. Further let $T \in \mathcal{L}(X,Z)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1) $\dim\ker T < \infty$ *and* $\operatorname{rg} T$ *is closed,*
2) *there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $u \in X$*

$$\|u\|_X \le C(\|u\|_Y + \|Tu\|_Z) \quad (\textit{a-priori estimate}).$$

Proof of Proposition 3.14. Using (3.10) and Lemma 3.16 with $X = (\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_A)$ and $Y = Z = x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$, we obtain $\dim\ker A|_{\mathcal{D}} < \infty$ and $\operatorname{rg} A|_{\mathcal{D}}$ closed. On the other hand, the adjoint A^* of a cone operator A is just a closed extension of its b-elliptic formal adjoint $A^\star$, cf. Proposition 3.13. Applying again Lemma 3.16 we get $\dim\ker(A|_{\mathcal{D}})^* < \infty$.

To verify the index formula consider the inclusion $\iota : \mathcal{D}_{\min} \to \mathcal{D}$ which is clearly Fredholm (use the same argument but now with $X = (\mathcal{D}_{\min}, \|\cdot\|_A)$, $Y = x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$ and $Z = (\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_A)$). Then $\operatorname{ind}\iota = -\dim\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}$, hence

$$\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_{\min}} = \operatorname{ind}(A|_{\mathcal{D}} \circ \iota) = \operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}} + \operatorname{ind}\iota = \operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}} - \dim\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}.$$

□

As a consequence of Propositions 3.2 and 3.14, for any closed extension of

$$A : C_c^\infty(\overset{\circ}{M}; E) \subset x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E)$$

with domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ there is a finite dimensional space $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \oplus \mathcal{E}' \ \text{ (algebraic direct sum).}$$

From Proposition 3.14 we also get the following two corollaries

Corollary 3.17. *Let* $A : \mathcal{D}_1 \to x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E)$ *and* $A : \mathcal{D}_2 \to x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E)$ *be closed extensions of* A *such that* $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$, $\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_1} < 0$ *and* $\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_2} > 0$. *Then there exists a domain* $\mathcal{D}$ *with* $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ *such that* $\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$.

The interest of this corollary lies in the fact that the vanishing of the index is necessary for the existence of the resolvent and of selfadjoint extensions.

Corollary 3.18. *Let* $A : \mathcal{D}_1 \to x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E)$ *and* $A : \mathcal{D}_2 \to x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2(M;E)$ *be closed extensions of* A. *Then*

$$\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_2} - \operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = \dim \mathcal{D}_2/\mathcal{D}_{\min} - \dim \mathcal{D}_1/\mathcal{D}_{\min}.$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ *then*

$$\operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_2} - \operatorname{ind} A|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = \dim \mathcal{D}_2/\mathcal{D}_1.$$

This corollary implies the well-known relative index theorems for operators acting on the weighted Sobolev spaces $x^\gamma H_b^m(M;E)$, cf. [10], [14].

4. Equality of domains

In this section we give sufficient conditions for the domains of different operators to be equal. Of these results, only the one concerning Friedrichs extensions will be used later on.

An operator $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ is said to vanish on ∂M to order k ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) if for any $u \in C^\infty(M;E)$, $x^\nu A u$ vanishes to order k on ∂M. Let

$$\lceil s \rceil = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid s \le k\}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let* A_0, $A_1 \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ *be b-elliptic.*

1. *If* $A_0 - A_1$ *vanishes on* ∂M, *then* $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_1)$.
2. *If* $A_0 - A_1$ *vanishes to order* $\ell \le \nu - 1$ *on* ∂M, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, *then*
$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) \cap x^{\frac{\nu}{2} - \ell - 1} H_b^m(M;E) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_1) \cap x^{\frac{\nu}{2} - \ell - 1} H_b^m(M;E).$$
3. *If* $A_0 - A_1$ *vanishes to order* $\lceil \nu - 1 \rceil$ *on* ∂M, *then* $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_1)$.
4. *If* A_0 *and* A_1 *are symmetric and bounded from below and* $A_0 - A_1$ *vanishes to order* $\lceil \nu - 1 \rceil$ *on* ∂M, *then the domains of their Friedrichs extensions coincide, that is,* $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_F(A_1)$.

Proof. First of all, observe that in all cases it is enough to prove only one inclusion; the equality of the sets follows then by exchanging the roles of A_0 and A_1.

To prove part 1, write

$$A_1 = A_0 + (A_1 - A_0) = A_0 + x^{-\nu} P x$$

with $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ and suppose $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0)$. There is then a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^\infty(\overset{\circ}{M};E)$ such that $u_n \to u$ and $A_0 u_n \to A_0 u$, in $x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2$. Consequently, $x u_n \to x u$ in $x^{\nu/2} H_b^m$ and $x^{-\nu} P x u_n \to x^{-\nu} P x u$ in $x^{-\nu/2} L_b^2$. Thus $A_1 u_n \to A_0 u + x^{-\nu} P x u$ which implies $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_1)$.

Now, let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \leq \nu - 1$, and let $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) \cap x^{\nu/2-\ell-1}H_b^m$. This means $u \in x^{\nu/2-\ell-1}H_b^m$ and $A_0 u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. To prove that $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_1) \cap x^{\nu/2-\ell-1}H_b^m$ we only need to show that $A_1 u$ belongs to $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. Let $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ be such that $A_1 = A_0 + x^{-\nu}Px^{\ell+1}$. Since $u \in x^{\nu/2-\ell-1}H_b^m$ then $x^{-\nu}Px^{\ell+1}u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. Hence $A_1 u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ which proves the second statement.

To prove the third statement, let $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0)$, $\ell = \lceil \nu - 1 \rceil$, and P as above. Then $u \in x^{-\nu/2}H_b^m$ and $x^{-\nu}Px^{\ell+1}u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$. Thus $A_1 u \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_1)$.

To prove part 4 we first prove the rather useful and well known abstract characterization of the domain of the Friedrichs extension of a symmetric semibounded operator given in Lemma 4.3 below. Suppose $A : \mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset H \to H$ is a densely defined closed operator which is symmetric and bounded from below. Let $A^\star : \mathcal{D}_{\max} \subset H \to H$ be its adjoint and let $A_F : \mathcal{D}_F \subset H \to H$ be the Friedrichs extension of A. Define

$$(u,v)_{A^\star} = c(u,v) + (A^\star u, v) \quad \text{for } u,\, v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $c = 1 - c_0$ and $c_0 \leq 0$ is a lower bound of A.

Lemma 4.3. *$u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_F$ if and only if there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ such that*

$$(u - u_n, u - u_n)_{A^\star} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Proof. Because of the fact that $\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}_F$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{A^\star}$ induced by (4.2), every $u \in \mathcal{D}_F$ can be approximated as claimed.

Let now $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ and let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}$ be such that $(u-u_n, u-u_n)_{A^\star} \to 0$, so $u_n \to u$ in H. Let $\mathcal{K} \subset H$ be the domain of the positive square root R of $A_F + cI$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_F = \mathcal{D}_{\max} \cap \mathcal{K}$. Hence $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_F$ if $u \in \mathcal{K}$, and the identity

$$\|u_n - u_\ell\|_{A^\star} = \|R(u_n - u_\ell)\|$$

implies that $\{Ru_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ also converges in H. Thus $u \in \mathcal{K}$ since R is closed. $\square$

We now prove part 4 of Proposition 4.1. Suppose that A_0 and A_1 satisfy the hypotheses there. Then by parts 1 and 3, $\mathcal{D}_{\min} = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\max} = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_1)$, and from the fact that $A_0 + A_1 - 2A_0$ vanishes to order $\lceil \nu - 1 \rceil$ we also get that $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0 + A_1) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0 + A_1) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}$. Since A_0 and A_1 are symmetric and bounded from below, so is $A_0 + A_1$. We will show that these three operators share the same Friedrichs domain by showing that

$$\mathcal{D}_F(A_0 + A_1) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A_0) \cap \mathcal{D}_F(A_1). \tag{4.4}$$

Suppose this has been shown. Since $[u,v]_{A_0} = [u,v]_{A_1} = \frac{1}{2}[u,v]_{A_0+A_1}$, Proposition 3.13 implies that A_0 is selfadjoint with either of the domains $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0)$ or $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0 + A_1)$, and from the inclusion of the latter in the former one deduces the equality of these spaces, hence, that $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_F(A_1)$. To prove (4.4), suppose $(A_i u, u)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \geq c_i(u,u)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2}$, $i = 0,\, 1$, on $\mathcal{D}_{\min}$, let $c = 1 - c_0 - c_1$. If $u \in \mathcal{D}_F(A_0 + A_1)$, then by Lemma 4.3 there is a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}(A_0(u-u_n), u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} + (A_1(u-u_n), u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \\ + c(u-u_n, u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.\end{aligned}$$

But then also

$$(1-c_i)(u-u_n,u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b}+(A_i(u-u_n),u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b}$$

as $n\to\infty$, $i=0$, 1, so $u\in\mathcal{D}_F(A_0)\cap\mathcal{D}_F(A_1)$. □

5. Spaces of Meromorphic Solutions

If K is a finite dimensional complex vector space, we let $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be the space of germs of K-valued meromorphic functions with pole at σ_0 and $\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be the subspace of holomorphic germs. These are naturally modules over the ring $\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$.

Let $R^\perp$ be another finite dimensional complex vector space. If $\mathcal{P}(\sigma):K\to R^\perp$ is a linear map depending holomorphically on σ in a neighborhood of σ_0, then $\mathcal{P}$ defines a map $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)\to\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$, which we also denote by $\mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ is defined near $\sigma=\sigma_0$, is invertible for $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$ but $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)=0$. Then there are $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be such that $\beta_j(\sigma)=\mathcal{P}(\sigma)(\psi_j(\sigma))$ is holomorphic and $\beta_1(\sigma_0),\dots,\beta_d(\sigma_0)$ is a basis of $R^\perp$. For any such ψ_j, if $u\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ and $\mathcal{P}u\in\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$, then there are $f_j\in\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $u=\sum_{j=1}^d f_j\psi_j$.*

Proof. Let $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^d$ be a basis of $R^\perp$ and define $\psi_j=\mathcal{P}^{-1}(b_j)$. Then the ψ_j are meromorphic with pole at σ_0, $\mathcal{P}\psi_j=\beta_j=b_j$ is holomorphic, and the $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ form a basis of $R^\perp$.

Let now $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be such that $\beta_j(\sigma)=\mathcal{P}(\sigma)(\psi_j(\sigma))$ is holomorphic and $\beta_1(\sigma_0),\dots,\beta_d(\sigma_0)$ is a basis of $R^\perp$. If $f\in\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$ then $f=\sum_j f_j\beta_j$ for some $f_j\in\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$, because the $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ form a basis, and each $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ can be written as a linear combination (over $\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$) of $\beta_1,\dots,\beta_d$. If $\mathcal{P}u=f$ then $\mathcal{P}(u-\sum_{j=0}^d f_j\psi_j)=0$, so $u=\sum_{j=0}^d f_j\psi_j$ for $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$, which is the equality of meromorphic functions. □

The lemma asserts that $\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp))$ is finitely generated as a submodule of $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ over $\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$. We will be interested in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}=\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp))/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ as a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$. The following fundamental lemma paves the way to describing a basis of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ is defined near $\sigma=\sigma_0$, is invertible for $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$ but $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)=0$. There are $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ such that each $\beta_j(\sigma)=\mathcal{P}(\sigma)(\psi_j(\sigma))$ is holomorphic, $\beta_1(\sigma_0),\dots,\beta_d(\sigma_0)$ form a basis of $R^\perp$, and if*

$$\psi_j=\sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1}\frac{1}{(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_j-\ell}}\,\psi_{j\ell}+h_j \tag{5.3}$$

with holomorphic h_j then the ψ_{j0} are linearly independent.

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $\sigma_0=0$. Pick a basis $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^d$ of $R^\perp$ and define $\psi_j=\mathcal{P}^{-1}(b_j)$. Then the ψ_j are meromorphic with pole at 0, $\mathcal{P}\psi_j=\beta_j=b_j$ is holomorphic, and the $\beta_j(0)$ are independent. Each ψ_j can be written as (5.3).

Order them so that $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^d$ is nonincreasing and let

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde\mu_1 &= \max\{\mu_j \,|\, j=1,\dots,d\}\\ \tilde\mu_i &= \max\{\mu_j \,|\, \mu_j<\tilde\mu_{i-1}\}\quad i=2,\dots,L\\ s_i &= \max\{j \,|\, \mu_j=\tilde\mu_i\},\end{aligned}\tag{5.4}$$

that is,

$$\tilde\mu_1=\mu_1=\dots=\mu_{s_1}>\tilde\mu_2=\mu_{s_1+1}=\dots=\mu_{s_2}>\dots>\tilde\mu_L=\mu_{s_{L-1}+1}=\dots=\mu_d$$

If the vectors ψ_{j0}, $j=1,\dots,s_1$, are not linearly independent, then order the ψ_j with $j\le s_1$ so that $\psi_{10},\dots,\psi_{s_1',0}$ is a maximal set of linearly independent vectors among $\{\psi_{j0}\,|\,1\le j\le s_1\}$, write

$$\psi_{k0}=\sum_{j=1}^{s_1'}a_{kj}\psi_{j0}\ \text{ for } k=s_1'+1,\dots,s_1,$$

and replace ψ_k by $\psi_k-\sum_{j=1}^{s_1'}a_{kj}\psi_j$ for $k=s_1'+1,\dots,s_1$. Now $\mathcal{P}(\psi_k)=\beta_k-\sum_{j=1}^{s_1'}a_{kj}\beta_j$ for these indices, so it is still true that the $\mathcal{P}(\psi_j)(0)$ form a basis. With μ_j denoting the order of the pole of the new ψ_j, and again assuming the orders form a nonincreasing sequence, let $\tilde\mu_i$ and s_i be defined as above. Suppose that already ψ_{j0}, $j=1,\dots,s_i$ is an independent set. If $\psi_{s_i+1,0}$ depends linearly on $\psi_{1,0},\dots,\psi_{s_i,0}$ then put $s_{i+1}'=s_i$. Otherwise, reorder $\psi_{s_i+1,0},\dots,\psi_{s_{i+1},0}$ so that $\psi_{s_i+1,0},\dots,\psi_{s_{i+1}',0}$ together with ψ_{j0}, $j=1,\dots,s_i$ are a maximally independent set in $\{\psi_{j0}\,|\,1\le j\le s_{i+1}\}$. If $s_{i+1}'<s_{i+1}$ write

$$\psi_{k0}=\sum_{j=1}^{s_{i+1}'}\alpha_{kj}\psi_{j0},\quad k=s_{i+1}'+1,\dots,s_{i+1}.$$

Replacing ψ_k by $\psi_k-\sum_{j=1}^{s_{i+1}'}\alpha_{kj}\,\sigma^{\mu_j-\tilde\mu_{i+1}}\psi_j$ ($s_{i+1}'+1\le k\le s_{i+1}$), reordering by decreasing order of the pole (which reorders only ψ_j, $j>s_{i+1}'$), now have that the leading coefficients of the ψ_j, $j\le s_{i+1}$, are independent. □

Lemma 5.5. *With the setup of Lemma 5.2, let $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be as stated there, and let μ_j be the order of the pole of ψ_j. Let*

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}=\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp))/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K),$$

regarded as a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$. Then the images in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ of the elements

$$(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\ell\psi_j,\quad j=1,\dots,d,\ \ell=0,\dots,\mu_j-1$$

form a basis of this space.

Proof. As before assume $\sigma_0=0$. Because of Lemma 5.1 the images of the $\sigma^\ell\psi_j$ span, and we only need to prove linear independence. Suppose $\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_j-1}u_{jk}\sigma^k\psi_j$ is holomorphic. Modulo holomorphic functions,

$$\psi_j=\sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1}\frac{1}{\sigma^{\mu_j-\ell}}\,\psi_{j\ell}$$

(where the ψ_{j0} are independent) so

$$u(\sigma)=\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_j-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-k}\frac{u_{jk}}{\sigma^{\mu_j-\ell-k}}\,\psi_{j\ell}$$

is holomorphic. Thus $\sigma^{\nu}u(\sigma)$ vanishes at 0 for $\nu>0$. Let the $\tilde\mu_i$ be as in (5.4). We have that $\sigma^{\tilde\mu_1}\psi_j(\sigma)$ vanishes at 0 for $j>s_1$, and so does $\sigma^{\tilde\mu_1}\sigma^k\psi_j(\sigma)$ for $k>0$. Hence

$$0=\Big(\sigma^{\tilde\mu_1}u(\sigma)\Big)\Big|_{\sigma=0}=\sum_{j=1}^{s_1}u_{j0}\Big(\sigma^{\tilde\mu_1}\psi_j(\sigma)\Big)\Big|_{\sigma=0}=\sum_{j=1}^{s_1}u_{j0}\psi_{j0},$$

and so $a_{0j}=0$ for $j=1,\dots,s_1$, since the ψ_{j0} are independent. If $\tilde\mu_2<\tilde\mu_1-1$ then by the same argument one concludes that $a_{1j}=0$ for $j=1,\dots,s_1$, and if $\tilde\mu_2=\tilde\mu_1-n$, $(n\ge 1)$ then the conclusion is that $a_{kj}=0$ for $j=1,\dots,s_1$ and $k=0,\dots,n-1$. Having proved this, we conclude

$$u(\sigma)=\sum_{j=1}^{s_1}\sum_{k=n}^{\tilde\mu_1-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\tilde\mu_1-k}\frac{u_{jk}}{\sigma^{\tilde\mu_1-\ell-k}}\,\psi_{j\ell}+\sum_{j=s_1+1}^{d}\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_j-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-k}\frac{u_{jk}}{\sigma^{\mu_j-\ell-k}}\,\psi_{j\ell}.$$

Now, since $\sigma^{\tilde\mu_2}u(\sigma)$ also vanishes at 0 then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s_1}u_{jn}\psi_{j0}+\sum_{j=s_1+1}^{s_2}u_{j0}\psi_{j0}=0,$$

therefore $u_{jn}=0$ for $j=1,\dots,s_1$, and $u_{j0}=0$ for $j=s_1+1,\dots,s_2$. Continuing in this manner, one obtains $u_{jk}=0$ for all j, k. ☐

Lemma 5.6. *With the setup of Lemma 5.2, let* $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d$ *be as stated there, let* μ_j *be the order of the pole of* ψ_j*. Suppose the* ψ_j *ordered so that* $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^d$ *is nonincreasing. With the notation in formulas*(5.3) *and* (5.4) *let*

$$K_{\tilde\mu_\ell}=\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb C}\{\psi_{j0}\,|\,\mu_j\ge\tilde\mu_\ell\}.$$

The spaces $K_{\tilde\mu_\ell}$ *are independent of the choice of* ψ_j*.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak K_\mu=\{\psi\in\mathcal P^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp))\,|\,\operatorname{ord}(\psi)\le\mu\}$. Thus if $\psi\in\mathfrak K_\mu$ then $(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\mu\psi$ is regular; let $m_\mu:\mathfrak K_\mu\to K$ be defined by setting

$$m_\mu(\psi)=(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\mu\psi(\sigma)|_{\sigma=\sigma_0}.$$

We will show that $K_{\tilde\mu_\ell}=m_{\tilde\mu_\ell}(\mathfrak K_{\tilde\mu_\ell})$. To see this, set

$$\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_\ell}=\operatorname{span}_{\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb C)}\{\psi_j\,|\,\operatorname{ord}(\psi_j)=\tilde\mu_\ell\}.$$

and note that if $\mu\ge\tilde\mu_1$ then

$$\mathfrak K_\mu=\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_1}+\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_2}+\dots+\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_L}$$

and if $\tilde\mu_{\ell-1}\ge\mu\ge\tilde\mu_\ell$ then

$$\mathfrak K_\mu=(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\tilde\mu_1-\mu}\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_1}+\dots+(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\tilde\mu_{\ell-1}-\mu}\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_{\ell-1}}+\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_\ell}+\dots+\mathfrak K^\psi_{\tilde\mu_L}.$$

This is proved using Lemma 5.1. Thus if $\tilde\mu_{\ell-1}\ge\mu>\tilde\mu_\ell$ then

$$m_\mu(\mathfrak K_\mu)=\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb C}\{\psi_{j0}\,|\,\mu_j>\tilde\mu_\ell\}$$

and if $\mu=\tilde\mu_\ell$ then

$$m_\mu(\mathfrak K_\mu)=\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb C}\{\psi_{j0}\,|\,\mu_j\ge\tilde\mu_\ell\}.$$

□

Note that $K_{\tilde\mu_1} \subset \cdots \subset K_{\tilde\mu_L} = K$, $\dim K_{\tilde\mu_\ell} = s_\ell$ and $m_{\tilde\mu_\ell} : \mathfrak{K}_{\tilde\mu_\ell} \to K_{\tilde\mu_\ell}$ is surjective. As in see Gohberg and Sigal [4], the numbers μ_j will be called the partial multiplicities of $\mathcal{P}$ (at σ_0) .

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\{\psi_i^\star\}_{i=1}^d$, $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^d \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ be as in Lemma 5.2, both sequences ordered so that the sequences $\{\mu_i^\star\}$, $\{\mu_j\}$ of the orders of the poles is nonicreasing. Then $\mu_i^\star = \mu_i$ for all i and*

$$\psi_i^\star = \sum_{j=1}^d f_{ij}\psi_j$$

where the f_{ij} are holomorphic, form a nonsingular matrix and $f_{ij} = (\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_i-\mu_j}\tilde f_{ij}$ for some holomorphic $\tilde f_{ij}$ if $\mu_i > \mu_j$. Conversely, given holomorphic functions f_{ij} forming a nonsingular matrix and with $f_{ij}/(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_i-\mu_j}$ holomorphic when $\mu_i > \mu_j$, then the ψ_j' defined by the formula above satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 5.2.

We leave the proof of this to the reader. It uses the previous lemma and its proof.

If K is a hermitian vector space, let $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d$ be an orthonormal basis of K such that for each $\ell = 1, \dots, L$,

$$\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{s_\ell} \in K_{\tilde\mu_\ell}$$

Then for $j = s_{\ell-1}+1, \dots, s_\ell$ we can pick $\psi_j \in \mathfrak{K}_{\tilde\mu_\ell}$ such that $m_{\tilde\mu_\ell}(\psi_j) = \phi_j$, that is, if K is hermitian then the ψ_j can be chosen to have orthogonal leading coefficients.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\mathcal{P}(\sigma) : K \to R^\perp$ be defined and holomorphic near $\sigma = \sigma_0$, invertible for $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$ but $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0) = 0$. Then*

1. *there are $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ such that each $\beta_j = \mathcal{P}\psi_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$, $\beta_1(\sigma_0), \dots, \beta_d(\sigma_0)$ form a basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$, and if*

   $$\psi_j = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1} \frac{1}{(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_j-\ell}}\,\psi_{j\ell} + h_j$$

   with holomorphic h_j then the ψ_{j0} are linearly independent,
2. *if K is a hermitian vector space, then the ψ_j can even be chosen such that the ψ_{j0} form an orthonormal basis of K and for $\ell > 0$, $\psi_{j\ell}$ is orthogonal to ψ_{k0} whenever $\mu_k \geq \mu_j - \ell$.*

Proof. Because of Lemma 5.2 there are $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d$ satisfying the first statement.

Let now K be a hermitian vector space. We may assume that already the leading coefficients form an orthonormal basis of K. If a coefficient $\psi_{j\ell}$ with $\ell > 0$ is not already orthogonal to those ψ_{k0} such that $\mu_k \geq \mu_j - \ell$, then write

$$\psi_{j\ell} = \psi_{j\ell}^0 + \sum_{\{k \,|\, \mu_k \geq \mu_j - \ell\}} a_k \psi_{k0}$$

where $\psi_{j\ell}^0$ is orthogonal to the ψ_{k0} such that $\mu_k \geq \mu_j - \ell$. Then

$$\chi(\sigma) = \sum_{\{k \,|\, \mu_k \geq \mu_j - \ell\}} a_k(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_k-\mu_j+\ell}\psi_k(\sigma) \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mu_j-\ell} \subset \mathfrak{K}_{\mu_j}$$

($\mathfrak{K}_\mu$ being defined using σ_0) and $(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_j}\chi(\sigma)|_{\sigma=\sigma_0}=0$. So $\psi_j-\chi$ has the same leading term as ψ_j but now the coefficient of $(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{-\mu_j+\ell}$ is $\psi^0_{j\ell}$ which is orthogonal to ψ_{k0} for k such that $\mu_k\geq\mu_j-\ell$. We may then replace ψ_j by $\psi_j-\chi$. The proof is completed by 'reverse' induction on $n=\mu_j-\ell$ beginning with $n=\tilde\mu_1-1$, the above being both the first and general steps. □

Let now Y be a compact manifold and E a complex vector bundle over Y. We fix a hermitian metric on E and riemannian metric on E with respect to which we define the Sobolev spaces $H^s(Y;E)$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\sigma):H^m(Y;E)\to L^2(Y;E)$ be a holomorphic family of elliptic operators of order m defined for σ near σ_0 in $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ is invertible for $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$ but $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)$ is not invertible. Let $K=\ker\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)$, $R=\operatorname{rg}\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)$. Then K and $R^\perp$ are finite dimensional of the same dimension, say d, and consist of smooth sections of E. Regard $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ as an operator

$$\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{P}_{11}(\sigma) & \mathcal{P}_{12}(\sigma)\\ \mathcal{P}_{21}(\sigma) & \mathcal{P}_{22}(\sigma)\end{bmatrix}:\begin{matrix}K\\ \oplus\\ K^\perp\end{matrix}\to\begin{matrix}R^\perp\\ \oplus\\ R\end{matrix}$$

in the usual way. All the $\mathcal{P}_{ij}$ are holomorphic, and the operator $\mathcal{P}_{22}(\sigma)$ is invertible for σ close to σ_0. Thus $\mathcal{P}_{11}-\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}:K\to R^\perp$ depends holomorphically on $\sigma\in U$ and is invertible for $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$. We can then find $\tilde\psi_1,\dots,\tilde\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ such that $(\mathcal{P}_{11}-\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21})\tilde\psi_j\in\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$, as in Lemma 5.2. Let ψ_j be the singular part of $\tilde\psi_j-\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}\tilde\psi_j$. In this last function, $\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}\tilde\psi_j$ has values in $K^\perp$, while $\tilde\psi_j$ has values in K, so the order of the pole of ψ_j is the same as that of $\tilde\psi_j$ (there is no cancellation). Note that furthermore the order of the pole of $\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}\tilde\psi_j$ is lower than that of $\tilde\psi_j$ because $\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}$ vanishes at $\sigma=\sigma_0$. Let μ_j be the order of the pole of ψ_j.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\hat u$ be an $H^m(Y;E)$-valued meromorphic function with pole at 0. Then $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)(\hat u(\sigma))$ is holomorphic if and only if there are $\mathbb{C}$-valued polynomials $p_j(\sigma)$ of degree μ_j-1 such that $\hat u-\sum_{j=1}^d p_j(\sigma)\psi_j(\sigma)$ is holomorphic. Thus if $\hat f$ is holomorphic and $\hat u=\mathcal{P}(\sigma)^{-1}(\hat f)$, then $\hat u$ is meromorphic with singularity of the form $\sum_{j=1}^d p_j(\sigma)\psi_j(\sigma)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\hat f=f\oplus g$ is a holomorphic function with values in $R^\perp\oplus R$ and let $\hat u=u\oplus v=\mathcal{P}(\sigma)^{-1}(f+g)$, $\sigma\neq\sigma_0$, decomposed according to $K\oplus K^\perp$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{11}u+\mathcal{P}_{12}v&=f\\ \mathcal{P}_{21}u+\mathcal{P}_{22}v&=g\end{aligned}$$

From the second equation, $v=\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}(g-\mathcal{P}_{21}u)$, which replaced in the first gives

$$(\mathcal{P}_{11}-\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21})u=f-\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}g.$$

Since the $\tilde\beta_j=(\mathcal{P}_{11}-\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21})\tilde\psi_j$ are holomorphic near σ_0 and independent at σ_0, there are f_j, $q_j\in\mathfrak{Hol}_0(\mathbb{C})$ such that $f=\sum f_j\tilde\beta_j$, $\mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}g=\sum q_j\tilde\beta_j$ (the q_j vanish at σ_0 because $\mathcal{P}_{12}$ does). Then $u=\sum_j(f_j-q_j)\tilde\psi_j$. Replacing this in the expression for v gives

$$v=\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}g+\sum_j(f_j-q_j)\mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}\tilde\psi_j$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} u+v &= \sum (f_j - q_j)(\tilde{\psi}_j - \mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{21}\tilde{\psi}_j) + \mathcal{P}_{22}^{-1} g \\ &= \sum_j p_j(\sigma)\psi_j + h, \end{aligned}$$

where the p_j are polynomials and h is holomorphic. $\square$

Note that each ψ_j can be written as

$$\psi_j(\sigma, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1} \frac{1}{\sigma^{\mu_j-\ell}}\, \psi_{j\ell}(y),$$

with smooth sections $\psi_{j\ell}$ of $E \to Y$.

Appendix: Saturated domains

Let H be a Hilbert space, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ open, and $S \subset \Omega$ a finite set. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)$ be the space of meromorphic H-valued functions on Ω with poles in S, and let $\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ be the subspace of holomorphic elements. Multiplication by a holomorphic function $f(\sigma)$ defines an operator

$$f(\sigma) : \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H) \text{ such that } f(\sigma)\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H) \subset \mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H),$$

so it induces an operator on $\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ also denoted $f(\sigma)$.

Definition 5.10. A subspace of $\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ which is invariant under multiplication by $f(\sigma) = \sigma$ will be called saturated.

A saturated subspace $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is thus a module over the ring $\mathbb{C}[\sigma]$.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $S = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s\}$. If $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ is saturated, then there are saturated spaces $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_j\}}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ such that*

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s. \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. For every j there is a polynomial $q_j(\sigma)$ such that $q_j(\sigma_j) = 1$ and $q_j(\sigma_k) = 0$ for $k \neq j$, with equalities satisfied to a sufficiently high order. Take $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j = q_j(\sigma)\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, which is saturated because $\sigma q_j(\sigma) = q_j(\sigma)\sigma$. Finally, note that $q_1 + \cdots + q_s = 1$ to high order at each σ_j. For more details see the proof of the next lemma. $\square$

Lemma 5.13. *A finite dimensional space $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,S}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ is saturated if and only if it is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$ for $\tau > 0$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is saturated, so by the previous lemma, $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s$ with saturated spaces $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_j\}}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$. It is then enough to prove that each $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$ is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$. But this is clear, since $\tau^{i\sigma}$ is a polynomial plus an entire function vanishing to high order at σ_j.

Suppose now that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$ for any $\tau > 0$. We will first reduce the problem to the situation where $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_0\}}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$. Let the integers μ_j be chosen so that for any representative ψ of en element of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, $(\sigma - \sigma_j)^\mu_j$ is regular at σ_0. It is possible to find such numbers because $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is finite dimensional. For any $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s) \in \mathbb{C}^s$ with $\zeta_j \neq \zeta_k$ if $j \neq k$, let $\wp_{jk}(\zeta) = \left[\frac{\zeta - \zeta_k}{\zeta_j - \zeta_k}\right]^{\mu_k}$, let $p_j(\zeta; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s) = \prod_{k \neq j} \wp_{jk}$. Then p_j vanishes to order μ_k at ζ_k, $k \neq j$, and has value 1 at ζ_j, so $p_j = 1 + (\zeta - \zeta_j)a_j$. The a_j are polynomials in ζ whose coefficients depend holomorphically on the ζ_j. Let $b_j = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1}(-1)^\ell[(\zeta-\zeta_j)a_j]^\ell$. This is again a polynomial in ζ, and so is $q_j = b_j p_j$. Thus there are polynomials in ζ with coefficients depending on the ζ_j, $h_{j,k}(\zeta;\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_s)$, $j,k = 1,\dots,s$, such that

$$Q_j(\zeta;\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_s) = \delta_{jk} + (\zeta-\zeta_k)^{\mu_k} h_{j,k}(\zeta;\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_s)$$

Let now $q_j(\sigma,\tau) = Q_j(\tau^{i\sigma};\tau^{i\sigma_1},\dots,\tau^{i\sigma_s})$, defined for those τ for which the numbers $\tau^{i\sigma_j}$ are distinct. Since this is a polynomial in $\tau^{i\sigma}$, and since $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$, each q_j defines a linear map $\pi_j : \hat{\mathcal{E}} \to \hat{\mathcal{E}}$. Since $q_j(\sigma,\tau) = \delta_{jk} + (\sigma-\sigma)^{\mu_k}\tilde{h}_{j,k}(\sigma,\tau)$, $\pi_j\psi_j \in \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_j\}}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ and $\pi_j \circ \pi_k = \delta_{jk}\pi_j$, and since $\sum_{j=1}^s q_j = 1$, $\sum_j \pi_j = I$. Thus with $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j = \pi_j(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ we get

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s$$

The spaces $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$ are invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$ because $\tau^{i\sigma}q_j = q_j\tau^{i\sigma}$. The π_j are independent of τ.

Suppose now that $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_0\}}(H)/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H)$ is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$ for all τ ($\tau = e$ suffices). Let $\lambda(w) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \frac{(-1)^{\ell+1}}{\ell}w^\ell$, so that $\lambda(e^\zeta - 1) = \zeta + \zeta^\mu h(\zeta)$, with $h(\zeta)$ entire, and some integer μ depending on N which may be assumed as large as desired by taking N large enough. Let $q(\sigma) = \lambda(\tau^{i\sigma}\tau^{-i\sigma_0} - 1)$. Then

$$q(\sigma) = i(\sigma-\sigma_0)\log\tau + (\sigma-\sigma_0)^\mu h(\sigma,\tau)$$

with $h(\sigma,\tau)$ holomorphic in σ. If $\psi \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, then $q\psi \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$ because q is a polynomial in $\tau^{i\sigma}$. But with μ large enough, $q\psi = (\sigma-\sigma_0)\log\tau\,\psi$. Thus $\mathcal{E}$ is saturated. □

One can also give a proof using that if $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is invariant under multiplication by $e_t(\sigma) = e^{i\sigma t}$ for any t then e_t defines a one parameter group on $\mathcal{E}$. This approach involves the topology of $\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\{\sigma_0\}}(H)$ (to prove that the group is continuous, hence differentiable). The proof given is better because it is elementary.

6. Canonical Pairing

Suppose that K and $R^\perp$ are hermitian finite dimensional vector spaces. Define a pairing

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,K} : \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K) \times \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(K) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$$

by

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K) \times \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(K) \ni (u,v) \mapsto \iota_{\sigma_0,K}(u,v) = (u(\sigma), v(\overline{\sigma})) \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C}).$$

and likewise a pairing $\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}$ associated with $R^\perp$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\sigma) : K \to R^\perp$ be defined and holomorphic in a neighborhood of $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Define $P^\star(\sigma) = P(\overline{\sigma})^*$, where $*$ denotes the pointwise adjoint of $\mathcal{P} : K \to R^\perp$. $P^\star$ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of $\overline{\sigma}_0$. Then with the induced map $\mathcal{P}^\star : \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(R^\perp) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(K)$ we have

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\mathcal{P}(\sigma)u(\sigma), v(\sigma)) = \iota_{\sigma_0,K}(u(\sigma), \mathcal{P}^\star(\sigma)v(\sigma)).$$

Furthermore, define $\Theta : \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(\mathbb{C})$ by $\Theta(f)(\sigma) = \overline{f(\overline{\sigma})}$, and likewise $\Theta : \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let* $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$ *be such that the* $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ *are independent. Then there are* $\tilde\beta_1, \dots, \tilde\beta_d \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$ *such that*

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\beta_i, \tilde\beta_j) = \delta_{ij}.$$

If σ_0 *is real, then*

Proof. Let $b_i = \beta_i(\sigma_0)$ and write $\beta_i = b_i + (\sigma - \sigma_0)\sum_k a_{ik} b_k$ with $a_{ik} \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$. We seek $\tilde\beta_j = \sum h_{\ell j} b_\ell$ with $h_{\ell j} \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline\sigma_0}(\mathbb{C})$. We need

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\beta_i, \tilde\beta_j) = \sum_\ell \Theta(h_{\ell j})(b_i, b_\ell) + (\sigma - \sigma_0)\sum_{k,\ell} a_{ik}\Theta(h_{\ell j})(b_k, b_\ell) = \delta_{ij},$$

or, with the matrices $H = [h_{\ell j}]$, $A = [a_{ik}]$, $B = [(b_k, b_\ell)]$,

$$B\Theta(H) + (\sigma - \sigma_0)AB\Theta(H) = I$$

so set

$$\Theta(H) = [I + (\sigma - \sigma_0)B^{-1}AB)]^{-1}B^{-1}.$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *Let* $\mathcal{P}(\sigma) : K \to R^\perp$ *be defined and holomorphic near* σ_0*, invertible for* $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$*,* $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0) = 0$*. Let* $\psi_j \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ *have independent leading coefficients and be such that* $\beta_j = \mathcal{P}\psi_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$*, with the* $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ *linearly independent. Let* $\tilde\beta_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$ *be such that*

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\beta_i, \tilde\beta_j) = \delta_{ij}.$$

Let μ_j *be the order of the pole of* ψ_j*, let* $\tilde\beta^\star_j = (\sigma - \sigma_0)^{\mu_j}\psi_j$*, so* $\tilde\beta^\star_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ *and the* $\tilde\beta^\star_j(\sigma_0)$ *are independent. Let* $\beta^\star_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline\sigma_0}(K)$ *be such that*

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde\beta^\star_i, \beta^\star_j) = \delta_{ij}.$$

Then $\mathcal{P}^\star\tilde\beta_j = (\sigma - \overline\sigma_0)^{\mu_j}\beta^\star_j$ *so with*

$$\psi^\star_j = \frac{1}{(\sigma - \overline\sigma_0)^{\mu_j}}\tilde\beta_j$$

we have

$$\mathcal{P}^\star(\psi^\star_j) = \beta^\star_j.$$

Clearly the leading coefficients of the $\psi^\star_j$ *are independent, as are the* $\tilde\beta_j(\overline\sigma_0)$*, thus the multiplicities* $\mu^\star_j$ *for* $\mathcal{P}^\star$ *are the same as those for* $\mathcal{P}$*,* $\mu^\star_j = \mu_j$*.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{P}\tilde\beta^\star_j = (\sigma - \sigma_0)^{\mu_j}\beta_j$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\mathcal{P}\tilde\beta^\star_j, \tilde\beta_k) &= (\sigma - \sigma_0)^{\mu_k}\delta_{jk}\\ &= (\sigma - \sigma_0)^{\mu_k}\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde\beta^\star_j, \beta^\star_k)\\ &= \iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde\beta^\star_j, (\sigma - \overline\sigma_0)^{\mu_k}\beta^\star_k)\end{aligned}$$

The last expression must be $\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde\beta^\star_j, \mathcal{P}^\star\tilde\beta_k)$, so $\mathcal{P}^\star\tilde\beta_k = (\sigma - \overline\sigma_0)^{\mu_k}\beta^\star_k$. □

With the assumptions on $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ as in the previous lemma let

$$u \in \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K)) \quad\text{and}\quad v \in (\mathcal{P}^\star)^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(R^\perp)).$$

With suitable small ε (depending on representatives of u and v) we get a number

$$[u,v]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{|\sigma-\sigma_0|=\varepsilon} \iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\mathcal{P}u,v)\,d\sigma.$$

The circle of integration is oriented counterclockwise. If v is holomorphic, then $[u,v]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=0$ because $\mathcal{P}u$ is holomorphic. If u is holomorphic, then also $[u,v]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=0$, since

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{|\sigma-\sigma_0|=\varepsilon} \iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\mathcal{P}u,v)\,d\sigma = \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{|\sigma-\sigma_0|=\varepsilon} \iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(u,\mathcal{P}^\star v)\,d\sigma$$

Thus $[\cdot,\cdot]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$ defines a pairing

$$[\cdot,\cdot]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} : \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}\times\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0}\to\mathbb{C},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0} &= \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K))/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K),\\ \hat{\mathcal{E}}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0} &= (\mathcal{P}^\star)^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(R^\perp))/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(R^\perp).\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Theorem 6.4. $[\cdot,\cdot]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$ *is a nonsingular paring of vector spaces.*

Proof. Pick $\psi_j \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ such that $\mathcal{P}\psi_j = \beta_j \in \mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(R^\perp)$, with the leading coefficients of the ψ_j forming a basis of K and with the $\beta_j(\sigma_0)$ forming a basis of $R^\perp$. Let $\tilde\beta_j$, $\tilde\beta^\star_j$, and $\beta^\star_j$ be as in Lemma 6.2. According to the proof of Lemma 5.5, if $u\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ and $v\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0}$ then u and v are represented by

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_i-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^k u_{ik}\psi_i \quad\text{and}\quad v = \sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1}(\sigma-\overline{\sigma}_0)^\ell v_{j\ell}\psi^\star_j \tag{6.5}$$

with constant u_{ik} and $v_{j\ell}$. Now,

$$\mathcal{P}(u) = \sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_i-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^k u_{ik}\beta_i$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\mathcal{P}u,v) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\mu_i-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{k+\ell}u_{ik}\overline{v}_{j\ell}\;\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\beta_i,\psi^\star_j)\\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\mu_i-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{k+\ell-\mu_j}u_{ik}\overline{v}_{j\ell}\;\iota_{\sigma_0,R^\perp}(\beta_i,\tilde\beta_j)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\mu_j-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{k+\ell-\mu_j}u_{jk}\overline{v}_{j\ell}\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$[u,v]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} = i\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{k+\ell-\mu_j=-1}u_{jk}\overline{v}_{j\ell} = i\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_j-1}u_{jk}\overline{v}_{j,\mu_j-k-1} \tag{6.6}$$

If $[u,v]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} = 0$ for all v, pick v as above so that $v_{j\ell} = u_{j,\mu_j-\ell-1}$, $j = 1,\dots,d$, $\ell = 0,\dots,\mu_j - 1$. Then

$$[u,v]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} = i\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{k=0}^{\mu_j-1} u_{jk}\overline{u}_{jk} = 0$$

implies $u = 0$. □

Remark 6.7. In the situation of the proposition and with the notation in the proof, suppose that all μ_j are even. Let

$$U = \{\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1} (\sigma-\sigma_0)^\ell u_{j\ell}\psi_j \mid u_{j\ell}\in\mathbb{C}\}$$

which can be regarded as a subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$. Likewise, since the $\mu_j^\star$ associated with $\mathcal{P}$ are equal to the μ_j's, define

$$V = \{\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1} (\sigma-\overline{\sigma}_0)^\ell v_{j\ell}\psi_j^\star \mid v_{j\ell}\in\mathbb{C}\}$$

which again can be regarded as a subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0}$. It follows from (6.6) that

$$[u,v]_A = 0 \quad \text{if } u\in U, v\in V$$

and therefore, by dimensional considerations and the proposition itself, the orthogonal of U in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0}$ is V.

The spaces U and V are independent of the ψ_j used to represent them, as long as these functions are chosen according to Lemma 5.2. Indeed, if $\{\psi_i'\}_{i=1}^d$ is another such choice, then according to Lemma 5.7, possibly after reordering, we can write

$$\psi_i' = \sum_{\{j\,|\,\mu_j<\mu_i\}} (\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_j-\mu_i} f_{ij}\psi_i + \sum_{\{j\,|\,\mu_j\ge\mu_i\}} f_{ij}\psi_i$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_j/2}\psi_i' = &\sum_{\{j\,|\,\mu_j<\mu_i\}} (\sigma-\sigma_0)^{(\mu_j-\mu_i)/2} f_{ij}\,(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_i/2}\psi_i\\ &+ \sum_{\{j\,|\,\mu_j\ge\mu_i\}} (\sigma-\sigma_0)^{(\mu_j-\mu_i)/2} f_{ij}\,(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_i/2}\psi_i\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.8. *Suppose σ_0 is real, let $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ have independent leading coefficients and be such that their orders μ_j form a nonincreasing sequence. Then there are holomorphic functions f_{ij} with $f_{ij}=0$ if $i>j$ such that*

$$\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\sum_{k=1}^{i}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_k-\mu_i} f_{ik}\psi_k, \sum_{\ell=1}^{j}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^{\mu_\ell-\mu_j} f_{j\ell}\psi_\ell) = (\sigma-\sigma_0)^{-\mu_i-\mu_j}\delta_{ij} \tag{6.9}$$

This lemma combined with Lemma 5.7 says that when σ_0 is real, the $\tilde{\beta}_i^\star$ in Lemma 6.2 can be assumed to form an "orthonormal" system: $\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde{\beta}_i^\star, \tilde{\beta}_j^\star) = \delta_{ij}$.

Proof. We apply the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization process. There is no loss of generality if we assume $\sigma_0 = 0$. Write $\tilde\beta_i^\star = \sigma_j^\mu \psi_j$. The holomorphic function $h(\sigma) = \iota_{0,K}(\tilde\beta_1^\star, \tilde\beta_1^\star)$ is positive when σ is real, so there is $k(\sigma)$ positive defined for σ real (close to 0) such that $k^2 = h$. Since k is real analytic, it has a holomorphic extension to a neighborhood of 0. Since $k(\sigma)\overline{k(\overline{\sigma})} = h(\sigma)$ holds when σ is real, equality holds also for complex σ near 0. Let $f_{11} = 1/k$. Then (6.9) holds for i, $j = 1$, and we replace ψ_1 with $k^{-1}\psi_1$ and each ψ_i, $i > 1$, by $\psi_i - (\sigma - \sigma_0)^{\mu_1 - \mu_i}\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\psi_i, \psi_1)h^{-1}\psi_1$. Now repeat the process with ψ_2 and ψ_i with $i > 2$. $\square$

Appendix: Selfadjoint subspaces

Suppose for the rest of this section that $R^\perp = K$ and $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Motivated by Proposition 3.13 a subspace $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$ of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ will be called $\mathcal{P}$-selfadjoint (or just selfadjoint if there is no risk of confusion) if

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0} = \{u \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0} \mid [u, v]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0} = 0 \text{ for all } v \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}\}.$$

In other words, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$ is selfadjoint if $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0} = (\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0})^\perp$ with respect to $[\cdot,\cdot]^\flat_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ be defined and holomorphic near σ_0 (real). We call $\mathcal{P}$ selfadjoint if $\mathcal{P}^\star(\sigma) = \mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ near σ_0. If $\mathcal{P}$ is selfadjoint we say that $\mathcal{P}$ is positive if for each real $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$ close to σ_0, $\mathcal{P}(\sigma) : K \to K$ is nonnegative.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be defined near $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, selfadjoint, positive, with $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0) = 0$. Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d \in \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K))$ be chosen as in Proposition 5.8. Then the numbers μ_j are even.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\sigma_0 = 0$. We use the notation of Proposition 5.8 and assume that the ψ_j are ordered so that the μ_j are nonincreasing in j and define $\tilde\mu_i$ and s_i as in (5.4). We replace the ψ_j by suitable linear combinations of themselves to arrange that with $\tilde\beta_j^\star = \sigma^{\mu_j}\psi_j$ we have $\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\sum_k(\tilde\beta_i^\star, \tilde\beta_j^\star) = \delta_{ij}$. This does not change the multiplicities μ_j. Thus $\tilde\beta_j^\star$ is holomorphic and the $\tilde\beta_j^\star(0)$ form a basis of K (orthonormal), and if $\mathcal{P}\psi_j = \beta_j$, then $\beta_j = \sum p_{j\ell}\tilde\beta_\ell^\star$ for some holomorphic functions $p_{j\ell}$. Thus

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde\beta_j^\star = \sigma^{\mu_j}\sum_\ell p_{j\ell}\tilde\beta_\ell^\star.$$

Since both the vectors $\beta_j(0)$ and the $\tilde\beta_j^\star$ give bases of K, the matrix $[p_{j\ell}(0)]$ is nonsingular. We have

$$\iota_{0,K}(\mathcal{P}\tilde\beta_j^\star, \tilde\beta_k^\star) = \sigma^{\mu_j}p_{jk}(\sigma)$$

and

$$\iota_{0,K}(\tilde\beta_j^\star, \mathcal{P}\tilde\beta_k^\star) = \sigma^{\mu_k}\overline{p_{kj}(\overline{\sigma})}.$$

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is selfadjoint, these two functions are equal. Consequently, if $\mu_k \geq \mu_j$, then $p_{jk}(\sigma) = \sigma^{\mu_k - \mu_j}\overline{p_{kj}(\overline{\sigma})}$. Thus $[p_{jk}(0)]$ is an upper-triangular block matrix, the i-th diagonal block corresponding to the indices j such that $\mu_j = \mu_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, L$). Moreover, these diagonal blocks are selfadjoint matrices. It follows that for each i one can replace the ψ_j (j such that $\mu_j = \tilde\mu_i$) by linear combinations of themselves with constant coefficients, and assume that the diagonal blocks of

$[p_{jk}(0)]$ are diagonal themselves. Let $p_{jj}(0)=\lambda_j$. Since $[p_{jk}(0)]$ is nonsingular, all λ_j are different from 0. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{0,K}(\mathcal{P}\tilde\beta_j^\star,\tilde\beta_j^\star)&=\sigma^{\mu_j}(p_{jj}+\sigma\sum_\ell p_{j\ell}h_{\ell j})\\&=\sigma^{\mu_j}(\lambda_j+\sigma f_j)\end{aligned}$$

for some holomorphic function f_j. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is positive, $\sigma^{\mu_j}(\lambda_j+\sigma f_j)$ is nonnegative for real σ, and then necessarily μ_j is even (and $\lambda_j>0$). □

If $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ is a saturated subspace of $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ (see the appendix of Section 5 for the definition) then there is a set of elements $\psi_j\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$, $j=1\dots,d$, such that the products $(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\ell\psi_j$, $\ell=0,\dots,\mu_j-1$ form a basis of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$. The proof of this is that of Lemma 5.2 where only the saturation property was used. We may further assume, as in that lemma, that if the ψ_j are represented as in (5.3), then the ψ_{j0} are independent and the μ_j form a nonincreasing sequence.

Proposition 6.11. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be defined near $\sigma_0\in\mathbb{R}$, selfadjoint, positive and such that $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_0)=0$, and let $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$ be a selfadjoint saturated subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$. Then every $u\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$ can be represented as*

$$u=\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1}(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\ell u_{j\ell}\psi_j$$

with constant $u_{j\ell}$, where the $\psi_1,\dots,\psi_d\in\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}(K))$ are chosen as in Proposition 5.8 and the μ_j are the respective multiplicities, which by Lemma 6.10 are even. The space of such elements will be denoted $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0,\frac12}$.

Proof. We may assume that $\sigma_0=0$, without loss of generality. By Remark 6.7, if we show that for some choice of ψ_j as in the statement the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$ can be represented as stated, then for any such choice of ψ_j they are represented as stated. We then take advantage of Lemma 6.8 and assume that if $\tilde\beta_j^\star=\sigma^{\mu_j}\psi_j$ then $\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\tilde\beta_j^\star,\tilde\beta_k^\star)=\delta_{ij}$. In the notation of Lemma 6.2 we then have $\beta_j^\star=\tilde\beta_j^\star$ (σ_0 is real). As in that lemma let $\beta_j=\mathcal{P}\psi_j$ and let $\tilde\beta_j\in\mathfrak{Hol}_0(K)$ be such that $\iota_{0,K}(\beta_j,\tilde\beta_k)=\delta_{ij}$. By Lemma 6.2, $\mathcal{P}^\star\sigma^{-\mu_j}\tilde\beta_j=\beta_j^\star$, but now the latter is equal to $\tilde\beta_j^\star$, and $\mathcal{P}$ is selfadjoint, so

$$\mathcal{P}(\sigma^{-\mu_j}\tilde\beta_j)=\tilde\beta_j^\star$$

Since both the $\tilde\beta_j(0)$ and the $\tilde\beta_j^\star(0)$ form bases of K, the functions $\psi_j^\star=\sigma^{-\mu_j}\tilde\beta_j$ satisfy the conditions in Lemma 5.7, so they are related as stated there, and from Remark 6.7 we get that if

$$u=\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1}\sigma^\ell u_{j\ell}\psi_j,\qquad v=\sum_{j=1}^d\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1}\sigma^\ell v_{j\ell}\psi_j$$

then

$$[u,v]_{\sigma_0,\mathcal{P}}=0.$$

This said, we now show that if there is an element in $\mathcal{E}'_{\sigma_0}$ represented by

$$u=\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{\ell=\ell_j}^{\mu_j-1}\sigma^{\ell}u_{j\ell}\psi_j\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{\sigma_0}$$

($\ell_j\geq 0$) where for some j, $\ell_j<\mu_j/2$ with $u_{j,\ell_j}\neq 0$, then $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ is not selfadjoint. Thus let $\delta_j=\mu_j/2-\ell_j$, let $\delta=\max_j\delta_j$ and suppose $\delta\geq 1$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$ is saturated both $\sigma^{\delta-1}u$ and $\sigma^{\delta}u$ represent elements in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}$, and we will show that $[\sigma^{\delta-1}u,\sigma^{\delta}u]_{0.\mathcal{P}}\neq 0$. Let $J=\{j:\delta_j=\delta\}$. Then

$$\sigma^{\delta-1}u\equiv\sum_{j\in J}u_{j\ell_j}\sigma^{\mu_j/2-1}\psi_j+\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{\ell=\mu_j/2}^{\mu_j-1}\sigma^{\ell}\tilde{u}_{j,\ell}\psi_j\qquad\mod\mathfrak{Hol}_0(K)$$

with some $\tilde{u}_{j\ell}$. Write this as $u_0+\tilde{u}_1$. Then

$$[u_0+u_1,\sigma u_0+\sigma u_1]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=[u_0,\sigma u_0+\sigma u_1]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$$

because of Remark 6.7,

$$[u_0,\sigma u_0+\sigma u_1]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=[\sigma u_0,u_0+u_1]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$$

because multiplication by σ is selfadjoint, and finally,

$$[\sigma u_0,u_0+\sigma u_1]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=[\sigma u_0,u_0]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$$

again by Remark 6.7. Thus $[\sigma^{\delta-1}u,\sigma^{\delta}]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=[u_0,\sigma u_0]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}$. As in the proof of Proposition 6.11, $\mathcal{P}\beta_j^{\star}=\sigma^{\mu_j}\sum_{k=1}^{d}p_{jk}\beta_k^{\star}$ with holomorphic p_{jk} which because of the selfadjointess are such that $p_{jk}(\sigma)=\sigma^{\mu_k-\mu_j}\overline{p_{kj}(\overline{\sigma})}$ if $\mu_k\geq\mu_j$. We thus have (since $\psi_j=\sigma^{-\mu_j}\tilde{\beta}_j^{\star}$)

$$\mathcal{P}u_0=\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{k}u_{j,\ell_j}p_{jk}\sigma^{\mu_j/2-1}\tilde{\beta}_k^{\star}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\mathcal{P}u_0,\sigma u_0)&=\sum_{j,j'\in J}\sum_{k=1}^{d}p_{j,k}u_{j,\ell_j}\sigma^{\mu_j/2-1}\overline{u}_{j',\ell_{j'}}\iota_{\sigma_0,K}(\beta_k,\sigma^{-\mu_{j'}/2}\psi_{j'})\\&=\sum_{j,j'\in J}p_{j,j'}\sigma^{\mu_j/2-\mu_{j'}/2-1}u_{j,\ell_j}\overline{u}_{j',\ell_{j'}}\end{aligned}$$

It is the residue of this what we will show is nonzero. Terms with $\mu_{j'}<\mu_j$ clearly do not contribute to the residue. For terms with $\mu_{j'}>\mu_j$ we have $p_{jj'}(\sigma)=\sigma^{\mu_{j'}-\mu_j}\overline{p_{j'j}(\overline{\sigma})}$; such terms again contribute nothing, and we conclude that

$$[u_0,\sigma u_0]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}=i\sum_{\substack{j,j'\in J\\ \mu_j=\mu_{j'}}}p_{j,j'}(0)u_{j,\ell_j}\overline{u}_{j',\ell_{j'}}$$

The positivity of $\mathcal{P}$ now enters again: as pointed out at the end of the proof of Lemma 6.10, the selfadjoint matrices $[p_{j,j'}]$ with j,j' such that $\mu_j=\mu_{j'}$ are positive definite. Thus $[u_0,\sigma u_0]_{\mathcal{P},\sigma_0}\neq 0$ since $u_{j,\ell_j}\neq 0$ for at least for one j. $\square$

Remark 6.12. Note that when the μ_j are even numbers the space

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}} = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{(\sigma-\sigma_0)^\ell \psi_j \,|\, j=0,\dots,d;\ \ell=\mu_j/2,\dots,\mu_j-1\}$$

is a *canonical* saturated subspace of $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}$, even if the operator $\mathcal{P}$ is not selfadjoint. The same holds for $\mathcal{E}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0,\frac{1}{2}}$, and we have $(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}})^\perp = \mathcal{E}^\star_{\overline{\sigma}_0,\frac{1}{2}}$.

7. Structure of the Adjoint Pairing

Let now $E \to M$ be a vector bundle, $H^s_b(M;E)$ be the totally characteristic Sobolev space of order s, defined as usual. Suppose that $A = x^{-\nu}P \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$, $\nu > 0$, is a b-elliptic cone operator considered initially as a densely defined unbounded operator

$$A : C^\infty_c(\overset{\circ}{M};E) \subset x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E),$$

and define $\mathcal{D}_{\min} = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$, $\mathcal{D}_{\max} = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ as in Section 3. It is well known from the proof of the existence of asymptotic expansions of solutions of $Pu = 0$ (cf. [5], [10], [14]) that if $u \in x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E)$ and $Au \in x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E)$, that is, $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$, then $\hat{u}$ is meromorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$ with values in $H^m(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})$ and poles contained in

$$\Sigma'(A) = (\operatorname{spec}_b(A) - i\mathbb{N}_0) \cap \{\sigma \,|\, -\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2\}. \tag{7.1}$$

Moreover, if for u as above, $\hat{u}$ is holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$, then in fact $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max} \cap x^{\nu/2-\varepsilon}H^m_b(M;E)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, so by Proposition 3.6, $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$. Thus $\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ is isomorphic to a certain subspace $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ of

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\Sigma'(A)}(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M})) \tag{7.2}$$

where $\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\Sigma'(A)}(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))$ is the space of meromorphic $H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M})$-valued functions on $\Omega = \{\sigma \,|\, -\nu/2 < \Im\sigma\}$ and $\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))$ is the subspace of holomorphic elements. It is clear that the space in (7.2) is localizable on $\operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ in the sense that it is isomorphic to the direct sum

$$\bigoplus_{\Sigma(A)} \mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\Sigma'_\sigma}(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))$$

where

$$\Sigma(A) = \{\sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \,|\, -\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2\} \tag{7.3}$$

and

$$\Sigma'_\sigma = \{\sigma - i\ell \,|\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ \ell < \Im\sigma + \nu/2\}. \tag{7.4}$$

It is also the case that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ is localizable: we will show that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ is the direct sum of the spaces

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\sigma(A) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}(A) \cap \big[\mathfrak{M}_{\Omega,\Sigma_\sigma(A)}(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))/\mathfrak{Hol}_\Omega(H^m(\partial M;E|_{\partial M}))\big].$$

To see this, begin by writing

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{N} P_k x^k + \tilde{P}_N x^N \tag{7.5}$$

where the P_k have coefficients independent of x near ∂M and $N = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \,|\, \nu \le k\}$. Let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(A) = \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\sigma | -\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2\}$. By the discussion immediately preceding Proposition 5.9 and the proposition itself with $\mathcal{P} = \hat{P}_0$

at σ_0, there are elements $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,0} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(C^\infty(\partial M; E_{\partial M}))$ and positive integers $\mu_{\sigma_0,j}$ (forming a nonincreasing sequence), $j = 1\dots, d_{\sigma_0}$, such that for any $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}$, if $\hat{P}_0(\sigma)\hat{u}(\sigma)$ is holomorphic at σ_0, then there are polynomials p_j such that $\hat{u} - \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\sigma_0,j}} p_j(\sigma)\psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,0}(\sigma)$ is holomorphic at σ_0. If $\Im\sigma_0 - \vartheta > -\nu/2$ define $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,\vartheta}$ inductively as the singular part at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ of

$$-\hat{P}_0^{-1}(\sigma) \sum_{\zeta=0}^{\vartheta-1} \hat{P}_{\vartheta-\zeta}(\sigma)\psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,\zeta}(\sigma + i(\vartheta - \zeta)).$$

and for convenience define $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,\vartheta} = 0$ if $\Im\sigma_0 - \vartheta \le -\nu/2$. The largest index θ such that $\Im\sigma_0 - \theta > -\nu/2$ will be denoted by $N(\sigma_0)$. Define also $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell,\vartheta}$ (for $\ell = 0, \dots, \mu_j - 1$) to be the principal part of $(\sigma + i\vartheta)^\ell \psi_{\sigma_0,j,0,\vartheta}$ (at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$), and finally, let

$$\Psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell} = \sum_{\vartheta \ge 0} \psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell,\vartheta}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N} P_k(\sigma)\Psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell}(\sigma + ik)$$

is holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2 - \varepsilon$ for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is now that the images in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ of the $\Psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell}$ form a basis (over $\mathbb{C}$). This is easy to prove beginning with the fact that the $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell,0}$ form a basis of $\hat{P}_0(\sigma)^{-1}/\mathfrak{Hol}_{\sigma_0}$. Once this is proved, the assertion about $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ being localizable is clear.

Note that one may multiply each $\psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell,\vartheta}$ by a suitable entire function which is equal to 1 to high order at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ so that the resulting function is, modulo an entire function, the Mellin transform of an element in $x^{-\nu/2}H^\infty(M; E)$. This will not change the fact that the images in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ of the modified $\Psi_{\sigma_0,j,\ell}$ form a basis. An immediate convenient consequence is

Lemma 7.6. *For each $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ there is $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ such that $(u - u_0)\hat{}$ is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$ with poles only in $\Sigma'(A)$.*

Definition 7.7. For $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(A)$, $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ is the space of elements $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ such that $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ represents an element in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0}(A)$, that is, $\hat{u}$ has poles at most at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ for $\vartheta = 0, \dots, N(\sigma_0)$. Further,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A).$$

For $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\}$, and if all the multiplicities $\mu_{\sigma_0,j}$ associated with σ_0 are even, we let $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}}(A)$ be the space of elements $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ such that

$$\hat{u} \mod \mathfrak{Hol}(\Im\sigma > -\varepsilon) \text{ belongs to } \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}}$$

for any small $\varepsilon > 0$. The space $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}}$ is the one defined in Proposition 6.11, now with $\mathcal{P} = \hat{P}_0$.

Thus, modulo $\mathfrak{Hol}(\Im\sigma > -\nu)$, the Mellin transform of an element $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ can be written as $\hat{u}(\sigma) = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N(\sigma_0)} \psi_\vartheta(\sigma)$ where the $\psi_\vartheta(\sigma)$ have poles only at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$, and from the fact that $\widehat{Pu}(\sigma) = \sum_{k,\vartheta} \hat{P}_k(\sigma)\psi_\vartheta(\sigma + i\vartheta)$ is holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$ one deduces that

$$\sum_{\vartheta=0}^{\ell} P_{\ell-\vartheta}(\sigma)\psi_\vartheta(\sigma + i(\ell-\vartheta)) \text{ is holomorphic if } \ell \leq N(\sigma_0). \tag{7.8}$$

Likewise, if $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0^\star}(A^\star)$ then $\hat{v}(\sigma) = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N(\sigma_0^\star)} \psi_\vartheta^\star(\sigma)$ where now

$$\sum_{\vartheta=0}^{\ell} P_{\ell-\vartheta}(\sigma + i(\ell-\vartheta))\psi_\vartheta^\star(\sigma + i(\ell-\vartheta)) \text{ is holomorphic if } \ell \leq N(\sigma_0^\star) \tag{7.9}$$

since from (7.5),

$$P^\star = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} x^\ell P_\ell^\star + x^N \tilde{P}_N^\star. \tag{7.10}$$

The closed extensions of $A : \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \subset x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$ are in one to one correspondence with the subspaces of $\mathcal{E}(A)$, therefore with the subspaces of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$. Since we are interested in duality and selfadjoint extensions, we will now turn our attention towards understanding the pairing $[u,v]_A$ for $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ as a pairing of elements of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$. In the following theorem and its proof, the pairing in the integrands is that of $L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})$.

Theorem 7.11. *Let $A = x^{-\nu}P \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ be b-elliptic, let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(A)$ and $\sigma_0^\star \in \Sigma(A^\star)$, suppose $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ are such that*

$$\hat{u} = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N(\sigma_0)} \psi_\vartheta \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{v} = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N(\sigma_0^\star)} \psi_\vartheta^\star \qquad \operatorname{mod} \mathfrak{Hol}(\Im\sigma > -\nu/2),$$

where ψ_ϑ has a pole only at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$, and $\psi_\vartheta^\star$ only at $\sigma_0^\star - i\vartheta$, in other words, $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0^\star}(A^\star)$. If σ_0 is not of the form $\overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $[u,v]_A = 0$. Otherwise, if $\sigma_0 = \overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\tau$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then

$$[u,v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{\vartheta=0}^{\tau} \oint_{\gamma_\vartheta} (\psi_{\tau-\vartheta}(\sigma), \sum_{\vartheta'=0}^{\vartheta} \hat{P}_{\vartheta-\vartheta'}^\star(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta-\vartheta')})\, \psi_{\vartheta'}^\star(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta-\vartheta')}))\, d\sigma,$$

where $\gamma_\vartheta = \gamma_0 + i\vartheta$ and γ_0 is a positively oriented simple closed curve surrounding $\overline{\sigma_0^\star}$. In particular, if $\tau = 0$, i.e., $\sigma_0 = \overline{\sigma_0^\star}$, then

$$[u,v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{\gamma_0} (\psi_0(\sigma), \hat{P}_0^\star(\overline{\sigma})\psi_0^\star(\overline{\sigma}))\, d\sigma. \tag{7.12}$$

Proof. For general $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ and $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$ supported near the boundary and equal to 1 near the boundary one has

$$[u,v]_A = [\omega u, \omega v]_A$$

because $(1-\omega)u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$, and analogously for $(1-\omega)v$. Recall that the Mellin transform was defined using a cut-off function like ω. Suppose P is written as in (7.5) where the P_ℓ have coefficients independent of x near the boundary, say, in a neighborhood of the closure of the support of ω. Then, using the expression for $A^\star$ obtained from (7.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\omega u,\omega v]_A = (x^{-\nu}\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} P_\ell\, x^\ell \omega u,\omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} - (\omega u, x^{-\nu}\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} x^\ell P_\ell^\star \omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b}\\ + (x^{-\nu}\tilde{P}_N\, x^N\omega u,\omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} - (\omega u, x^N\tilde{P}_N^\star x^{-\nu}\omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b}.\end{aligned}$$

The last two terms cancel out since $x^N u \in x^{\nu/2}H^m_b$ can be approximated from $C_c^\infty(\mathring{M};E)$ in $x^{\nu/2}H^m_b$ norm. Thus

$$[u,v]_A = (x^{-\nu}\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} P_\ell\, x^\ell \omega u,\omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} - (\omega u, x^{-\nu}\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} x^\ell P_\ell^\star \omega v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b}.$$

It is always the case that $\hat{u}$ has no poles on $\Im\sigma = \nu/2$, and adding a suitable element of $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ to u we may assume that $\hat{u}$ has no poles on $\Im\sigma = -\nu/2$. A similar remark applies to $\hat{v}$, and we may and will assume that neither $\hat{u}$ nor $\hat{v}$ has poles on $\Im\sigma = -\nu/2$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ let

$$\beta_0 = -\frac{\nu}{2} + \varepsilon \quad\text{and}\quad \beta_k = \frac{\nu}{2} - \varepsilon - N + k \;\text{ for } k = 1,\dots,N \tag{7.13}$$

We take $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\beta_0 < \beta_1$. There is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, if $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cup \operatorname{spec}_b(A^\star)$ and $-\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2$, then for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the point $\sigma - i\ell$ does not lie on a line $\Im\sigma = \beta_k$. That is, no $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ or $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$ has poles on a line $\Im\sigma = \beta_k$. Fix one such ε and let

$$S_k = \{\sigma \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \beta_k \le \Im\sigma \le \beta_{k+1}\}.$$

These strips partition $\{\sigma \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, -\nu + \varepsilon \le \Im\sigma < \nu/2 - \varepsilon\}$. We now show that

$$[u,v]_A = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \oint_{\partial S_k} (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat{P}_\ell(\sigma)\hat{u}(\sigma + i\ell), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma}))\, d\sigma \tag{7.14}$$

For any $\ell < N$ and ε small, we have, on the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(\frac{1}{x^\nu}P_\ell x^\ell u, v) &= (x^{\varepsilon-\nu}P_\ell x^\ell u, x^{-\varepsilon}v)\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=\frac{\nu}{2}} (\hat{P}_\ell(\sigma + i(\varepsilon-\nu))\hat{u}(\sigma + i(\varepsilon - \nu + \ell)), \hat{v}(\sigma - i\varepsilon))\, d\sigma\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=-\frac{\nu}{2}} (\hat{P}_\ell(\sigma + i\varepsilon)\hat{u}(\sigma + i(\varepsilon + \ell)), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma + i\varepsilon}))\, d\sigma\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=\beta_0} (\hat{P}_\ell(\sigma)\hat{u}(\sigma + i\ell), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma}))\, d\sigma\end{aligned}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(u, \frac{1}{x^\nu} x^\ell P_\ell^\star v) &= (x^{-\varepsilon}u, x^{\varepsilon-\nu} x^\ell P_\ell^\star v)\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=\frac{\nu}{2}} (\hat u(\sigma - i\varepsilon), \hat P_\ell^\star(\sigma + i(\varepsilon-\nu+\ell))\hat v(\sigma+i(\varepsilon-\nu+\ell)))\,d\sigma\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=\frac{\nu}{2}-\ell} (\hat u(\sigma - i\varepsilon + i\ell), \hat P_\ell^\star(\overline{\sigma - i\varepsilon})\hat v(\overline{\sigma-i\varepsilon}))\,d\sigma\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Im\sigma=\beta_{N-\ell}} (\hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

so

$$
\begin{aligned}
[u,v]_A &= \sum_{\ell=0}^N \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{\partial\{\sigma\mid \beta_0\le\Im\sigma\le\beta_{N-\ell}\}} (\hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma\\
&= \sum_{\ell=0}^N \sum_{k=0}^{N-\ell-1}\oint_{\partial S_k} (\hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma\\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\oint_{\partial S_k} (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma$ and suppose $\hat u = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^\infty \psi_\vartheta$, where ψ_ϑ has a pole only at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ and $\psi_\vartheta = 0$ if $\vartheta > N(\sigma_0)$, where $N(\sigma)$ be the number k such that $\sigma \in S_k$. Thus $\hat P_\ell(\sigma)\psi_\vartheta(\sigma+i\ell)$ has a pole at $\sigma_0 - i(\vartheta+\ell)$ if at all, and the poles of

$$
\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1}\sum_{\vartheta=0}^\infty \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\psi_\vartheta(\sigma+i\ell), \tag{7.15}
$$

if any, that lie in $\beta_k < \Im\sigma < \beta_{k+1}$, come from indices ϑ, ℓ with

$$
\beta_k < \Im\sigma_0 - (\vartheta+\ell) < \beta_{k+1},
$$

that is, $\vartheta + \ell = N(\sigma_0) - k$. So in (7.15) only the terms

$$
\sum_{\substack{\vartheta+\ell=N(\sigma_0)-k\\ 0\le\ell\le N-k-1\\ 0\le\vartheta\le N(\sigma_0)}} \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\psi_\vartheta(\sigma+i\ell)
$$

may produce poles in S_k. If $k > N(\sigma_0)$ there are no poles. If $k \le N(\sigma_0)$, this is

$$
\sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N(\sigma_0)-k} \hat P_{N(\sigma_0)-k-\vartheta}(\sigma)\,\psi_\vartheta(\sigma + i(N(\sigma_0)-k-\vartheta))
$$

(since $N(\sigma_0) < N$). This is in fact holomorphic, as stated in (7.8). Thus in (7.14), the integrals

$$
\oint_{\partial S_k} (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma
$$

are evaluated as residues on the conjugates of the poles of $\hat v$,

$$
[u,v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\sum_s \oint_{\gamma_{s,k}} (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat P_\ell(\sigma)\hat u(\sigma+i\ell), \hat v(\overline{\sigma}))\,d\sigma, \tag{7.16}
$$

where the $\gamma_{s,k}$ are simple closed positively oriented curves surrounding (and separating) the conjugates of the poles of $\hat{v}(\sigma)$ in the strip S_k.

Suppose now that also $\hat{v} = \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{\infty} \psi^\star_\vartheta$, where $\psi^\star_\vartheta$ has a pole only at $\sigma_0^\star - i\vartheta$. Here $\sigma_0^\star \in \Sigma(A^\star) = \overline{\Sigma(A)}$ and as before, $\psi^\star_\vartheta = 0$ if $\vartheta > N(\sigma_0^\star)$. Thus

$$\sigma \mapsto (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat{P}_\ell(\sigma)\hat{u}(\sigma + i\ell), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma}))$$

has poles at $\overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\vartheta$, $\vartheta = 0, \dots, N(\sigma_0^\star)$, and the pole in S_k satisfies $\beta_k < \Im\overline{\sigma_0^\star} + \vartheta < \beta_{k+1}$, that is, $k = N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star}) + \vartheta$. In particular, there are poles only in the strips with k satisfying

$$N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star}) \le k \le N - 1.$$

Pick a positively oriented simple closed curve γ_0 surrounding $\overline{\sigma_0^\star}$, let $\gamma_\vartheta = \gamma_0 + i\vartheta$. Using this, the right hand side of (7.16) becomes

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star})}^{N-1} \oint_{\gamma_{k-N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star})}} (\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \hat{P}_\ell(\sigma)\hat{u}(\sigma + i\ell), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma}))\, d\sigma.$$

Now replace $\sigma + i\ell$ by $\tilde{\sigma}$. The resulting expression is (dropping the tilde)

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star})}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-k-1} \oint_{\gamma_{k+\ell-N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star})}} (\hat{P}_\ell(\sigma - i\ell)\hat{u}(\sigma), \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma - i\ell}))\, d\sigma$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{N-N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star})-1} \oint_{\gamma_\vartheta} (\hat{u}(\sigma), \sum_{k=0}^{\vartheta} \hat{P}^\star_{\vartheta-k}(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta - k)})\, \hat{v}(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta - k)}\,))\, d\sigma$$

after reorganizing (notice that $N - N(\overline{\sigma_0^\star}) - 1 \le N(\sigma_0^\star)$). Now, if $\hat{v}(\sigma) = \sum_{\vartheta' \ge 0} \psi^\star_{\vartheta'}$ is as above, then for any given ϑ the only terms in

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\vartheta} \hat{P}^\star_{\vartheta-k}(\sigma + i(\vartheta - k)) \sum_{\vartheta'=0}^{N(\sigma_0^\star)} \psi^\star_{\vartheta'}(\sigma + i(\vartheta - k))$$

which may contribute to the integral along γ_ϑ are those which in principle have poles at $\sigma_0^\star - i\vartheta$, namely those in the sum

$$\sum_{\vartheta'=0}^{\vartheta} \hat{P}^\star_{\vartheta-\vartheta'}(\sigma + i(\vartheta - \vartheta'))\psi^\star_{\vartheta'}(\sigma + i(\vartheta - \vartheta')).$$

But according to (7.9), this has no poles at $\sigma_0^\star - i\vartheta$ (or anywhere else, for that matter). So, if $\hat{u}$ has no poles in $\{\overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\vartheta \,|\, \vartheta = 0, \dots, N(\sigma_0^\star)\}$ then $[u, v]_A = 0$. The only case where $[u, v]_A$ may be different from 0 occurs when there are integers $\vartheta, \vartheta' \ge 0$ such that $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta = \overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\vartheta'$, that is, if $\sigma_0 = \overline{\sigma_0^\star} + i\tau$ for some nonnegative integer τ, in which case

$$[u, v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\vartheta=0}^{\tau} \oint_{\gamma_\vartheta} (\psi_{\tau-\vartheta}(\sigma), \sum_{\vartheta'=0}^{\vartheta} \hat{P}^\star_{\vartheta-\vartheta'}(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta - \vartheta')})\, \psi^\star_{\vartheta'}(\overline{\sigma - i(\vartheta - \vartheta')}))\, d\sigma$$

as claimed in the theorem. $\square$

If σ_0, $\sigma_1 = \overline{\sigma_0^\star} \in \Sigma(A)$ are such that $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1 + i\tau$ with some integer $\tau > 0$, then if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0^\star}(A^\star)$ it may happen that $[u, v]_A \neq 0$.

Since $[u, v]_A = 0$ if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A^\star)$, or if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A^\star)$, there is a well defied pairing of elements of $\mathcal{E}(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}(A^\star)$.

Theorem 7.17. *$[\cdot,\cdot]_A^\flat$ is a nonsingular paring of $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A^\star)$.*

Proof. We work with (7.12). $\hat{P}_0(\sigma)$ is a closed operator $L^2(Y) \to L^2(Y)$ with domain $H^m = H^m(Y; E)$. Let $K = \ker \hat{P}_0(\sigma_0)$, $R = \hat{P}_0(\sigma_0)(H^m(Y))$. Decompose $P(\sigma)$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_{11}(\sigma) & \hat{P}_{12}(\sigma) \\ \hat{P}_{21}(\sigma) & \hat{P}_{22}(\sigma) \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{c} K \\ \oplus \\ K^\perp \cap H^m \end{array} \to \begin{array}{c} R^\perp \\ \oplus \\ R \end{array}$$

for σ near σ_0. Here $K^\perp$, $R^\perp$ are computed in $L^2(Y)$. Since $\hat{P}_0(\sigma_0)$ is Fredholm, $\hat{P}_0^\star(\overline{\sigma}_0)(H^m) = K^\perp$ and the analogous decomposition for $\hat{P}(\overline{\sigma})^* = \hat{P}^\star(\sigma)$ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_{11}^\star(\sigma) & \hat{P}_{21}^\star(\sigma) \\ \hat{P}_{12}^\star(\sigma) & \hat{P}_{22}^\star(\sigma) \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{c} R \\ \oplus \\ R^\perp \cap H^m \end{array} \to \begin{array}{c} K \\ \oplus \\ K^\perp \end{array}$$

near $\overline{\sigma}_0$. Since $\operatorname{ind} \hat{P}(\sigma) = 0$, $\dim K = \dim R^\perp$.

Let $u \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ represent an element in $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$, let ψ be the Mellin transform of ϕu. The principal part of ψ at σ_0 is the principal part ψ_0 at σ_0 of a germ of the form

$$\tilde{\psi} - \hat{P}_{22}^{-1} \hat{P}_{21} \tilde{\psi}$$

where $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_0}(K)$ is such that

$$(\hat{P}_{11} - \hat{P}_{12} \hat{P}_{22}^{-1} \hat{P}_{21}) \tilde{\psi} = \beta$$

is holomorphic near σ_0. Likewise let $u^\star \in \mathcal{E}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A^\star)$ represent an element in $\mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A^\star)$, $\psi^\star$ the Mellin transform of $\phi u^\star$. Again the principal part $\psi_0^\star$ of $\psi^\star$ at $\overline{\sigma}_0$ is the principal part at $\overline{\sigma}_0$ of germ of the form

$$\tilde{\psi}^\star - (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star$$

where $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(R^\perp)$ is such that

$$(\hat{P}_{11}^\star - \hat{P}_{21}^\star (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star) \tilde{\psi}^\star = \beta^\star$$

is holomorphic, near $\overline{\sigma}_0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \hat{P}_{11} - \hat{P}_{12} \hat{P}_{22}^{-1} \hat{P}_{21} \\ \mathcal{P}^\star &= \hat{P}_{11}^\star - \hat{P}_{21}^\star (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star \end{aligned}$$

Then as discussed before the lemma,

$$[u, v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\gamma_0} (\psi(\sigma), \hat{P}_0^\star(\overline{\sigma}) \psi^\star(\overline{\sigma})) d\sigma$$

with a positively oriented curve γ_0 surrounding σ_0 and no other pole. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{P}_0^\star(\tilde{\psi}^\star - (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star)\\
&\qquad = \hat{P}_{11}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star - \hat{P}_{21}^\star (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star + \hat{P}_{12}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star - \hat{P}_{22}^\star (\hat{P}_{22}^{-1})^\star \hat{P}_{12}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star\\
&\qquad = \mathcal{P}^\star \tilde{\psi}^\star
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\psi(\sigma), \mathcal{P}^\star(\overline{\sigma})\tilde{\psi}^\star(\overline{\sigma})) &= (\tilde{\psi}(\sigma) - \hat{P}_{22}(\sigma^{-1}\hat{P}_{21}(\sigma)\tilde{\psi}(\sigma), \mathcal{P}^\star(\overline{\sigma})\tilde{\psi}^\star(\overline{\sigma}))\\
&= (\tilde{\psi}(\sigma), \mathcal{P}^\star(\overline{\sigma})\tilde{\psi}^\star(\overline{\sigma}))
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$[u, v]_A = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\gamma_0} (\tilde{\psi}(\sigma), \mathcal{P}^\star(\overline{\sigma})\tilde{\psi}^\star(\overline{\sigma}))d\sigma.$$

Thus the pairing of $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A^\star)$ is the pairing of the spaces associated to $\mathcal{P}$ at σ_0 and $\mathcal{P}^\star$ at $\overline{\sigma}_0$ which Theorem 6.4 asserts is nonsingular. □

8. FRIEDRICHS EXTENSION

Suppose $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$, $A = x^{-\nu}P$, is b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below by some $c_0 \leq 0$, as an operator $C_c^\infty(\mathring{M};E) \subset x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$. The domain of the Friedrichs extension is denoted $\mathcal{D}_F(A)$. Recall (Definition 7.7) that we denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ the space of functions $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ such that $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ has poles at most at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ for $\vartheta = 0, 1, \dots$, by $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}$ the quotient $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ and by $[u,v]_A = (Au, v) - (u, A^\star v)$, as introduced in (3.12).

Lemma 8.1. *$\mathcal{D}_F(A)$ contains all $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ such that $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ has no poles in $\{\Im\sigma \geq 0\}$. That is, $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap H_b^m(M;E) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A)$.*

Proof. We will show that if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap H_b^m(M;E)$, there is a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathring{M};E)$ such that

$$c\|u - u_n\|^2_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} + (A(u - u_n), u - u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

This will imply $u \in \mathcal{D}_F(A)$ by Lemma 4.3. Consider $P = x^\nu A$ as an unbounded operator on $L_b^2(M;E)$. Since it is b-elliptic, we have $H_b^m(M;E) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}(P)$. Therefore, if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap H_b^m(M;E)$, there is a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathring{M};E)$ such that

$$\|u - u_n\|_{L_b^2(M;E)} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|P(u - u_n)\|_{L_b^2(M;E)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

With this sequence we have

$$\|u - u_n\|_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

since $L_b^2(M;E) \hookrightarrow x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
(A(u - u_n), u - u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} &= (P(u - u_n), u - u_n)_{L_b^2}\\
&\leq \|P(u - u_n)\|_{L_b^2}\|u - u_n\|_{L_b^2}
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$(A(u - u_n), u - u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 8.2. *$\mathcal{D}_F(A)$ contains no $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ such that $\hat{u}(\sigma)$ has a pole in $\{\Im\sigma > 0\}$. Thus $\mathcal{D}_F(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap x^{-\varepsilon} H_b^m(M;E)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ be such that $\Im\sigma_0 > 0$. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0} \cap \mathcal{D}_F$. In particular, $[u,v]_A = 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}_F(A)$ since A_F is selfadjoint. From the previous lemma we know that $\mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A)$, hence $[u,v]_A = 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A)$, hence $u = 0$ since by Theorem 7.17 the induced pairing $[\cdot,\cdot]_A^\flat$ of $\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}$ is nonsingular. ☐

As a consequence of these two lemmas we get

Theorem 8.3. *Suppose $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ is b-elliptic and semibounded. If*

$$\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\} = \varnothing,$$

then the domain of the Friedrichs extension of A is

$$\mathcal{D}_F(A) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)\\ -\nu/2<\Im\sigma<0}} \mathcal{D}_\sigma(A)$$

That is, $\mathcal{D}_F(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap H_b^m(M;E)$.

This finishes the discussion of the Friedrichs extension of A when $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\}$. In order to determine the domain of the Friedrichs extension if $\operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ does contain real elements, we need two more ingredients. The first is an invariance property, under certain circumstances (small ν), of $\mathcal{D}_F(A)$, which translates into the saturation property on the Mellin transform side. The second is the positivity of the conormal symbol of A when A is bounded from below.

Let $\omega \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a function with sufficiently small support, and equal 1 near the origin. Let ϕ be the flow of X, which we shall write multiplicatively: the integral curve of X through p is $t \mapsto \phi_{e^t}(p)$. We can write

$$\phi_{1/\tau}^*\mathfrak{m} = c_\tau^2\mathfrak{m}, \quad \phi_{1/\tau}^* x = \tau^{-1}\xi_\tau^2 x$$

with smooth positive functions c_τ and ξ_τ which are equal to 1 if $\tau = 1$, or if x is close to ∂M (how close depends on τ), or in complement of the support of ω. Thus we have

$$\int \phi_\tau^* f\,\mathfrak{m} = \int \phi_\tau^* f\,\phi_\tau^*(\phi_{1/\tau}^*\mathfrak{m}) = \int f\,c_\tau^2\mathfrak{m}$$

Recall that for sections u of E, $\phi_\tau^* u$ is the section whose value at p is the result of parallel transport of $u(\phi_\tau(p))$ to p along the curve through p. The connection is compatible with the hermitian form on E, so for sections u, v of E,

$$(\phi_\tau^* u, \phi_\tau^* v)_p = (u,v)_{\phi_\tau(p)}.$$

Let $\gamma_\tau = \phi_\tau^* \frac{1}{\xi_\tau^\nu c_\tau}$, define

$$\kappa_\tau u = \tau^{\nu/2}\gamma_\tau\phi_\tau^* u, \quad u \in C^\infty(M;E).$$

Then κ_τ defines an isometry

$$x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E) \to x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M;E)$$

and $\kappa_\tau^* = \kappa_{1/\tau}$. On functions f, κ_τ is defined as $\kappa_\tau f = \phi_\tau^* f$, so that if f is a function and u a section of E then $\kappa_\tau(fu) = \kappa_\tau(f)\kappa_\tau(u)$.

A subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset x^{-\nu/2} L^2_b(M;E)$ is κ-invariant if

$$\kappa_\tau u \in \mathcal{D} \text{ for every } u \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \tau > 0.$$

For example $C^\infty_c(M;E)$ is κ-invariant. Let $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ be arbitrary, write $A = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x^k A_k + x^N \tilde{A}_N$ where $x^\nu A_k = P_k \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ has coefficients independent of x near ∂M, and $\tilde{A}_N \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$. Then

$$\kappa_\tau A \kappa_\tau^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tau^{\nu-k} x^k A_k + \tau^{\nu-N} x^N \tilde{A}_{N,\tau}$$

for some $\tilde{A}_{N,\tau} \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$. In particular, for x near ∂M and τ smaller than some τ_0 (depending on x),

$$\kappa_\tau A_0 \kappa_\tau^{-1} = \tau^\nu A_0.$$

This identity and the κ-invariance of $C^\infty_c(M;E)$ easily imply that the canonical domains $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0)$, $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0) \cap x^\gamma H^m_b(M;E)$ are κ-invariant. If A_0 is symmetric and bounded from below, then using Lemma 4.3 one also proves easily that the domain $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0)$ of the Friedrichs extension is also κ-invariant.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ be b-elliptic. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ be a domain on which A is closed. $\mathcal{D}$ is κ-invariant if and only if the finite dimensional space*

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\mathcal{D} = \{\hat{u} : u \in \mathcal{D}\}/\mathfrak{Hol}(\Im\sigma > -\nu/2)$$

is a saturated space.

Proof. If u is a smooth function on M, then for $\tau > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\kappa_\tau u}(\sigma) &= \int x^{-i\sigma} \omega(x) u(\tau x, y) \frac{dx}{x} \\ &= \tau^{i\sigma} \int x^{-i\sigma} \omega(\tau^{-1} x) u(x,y) \frac{dx}{x} \\ &= \tau^{i\sigma} \hat{u}(\sigma) + \tau^{i\sigma} \hat{w}_\tau(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

for $w_\tau = (\omega(\tau^{-1}x) - \omega(x))u$. Now, since $\omega(\tau^{-1}x) - \omega(x)$ is a smooth function supported in the interior of M, then $\hat{w}_\tau$ is an entire function, that is, $\widehat{\kappa_\tau u}(\sigma) - \tau^{i\sigma} \hat{u}(\sigma)$ is entire. The same conclusion holds when u is a smooth section of E:

$$\widehat{\kappa_\tau u}(\sigma) = \tau^{i\sigma} \hat{u}(\sigma) \mod \mathfrak{Hol}_\mathbb{C}(C^\infty(\partial M; E|_{\partial M}))$$

This proves that $\widehat{\kappa_\tau u} \mod \mathfrak{Hol}(\Im\sigma > -\nu/2)$ is an element of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\mathcal{D}$ if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\mathcal{D}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\tau^{i\sigma}$, i.e., if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\mathcal{D}$ is saturated, due to Lemma 5.13. The assertion thus follows from the isomorphism between $\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\mathcal{D}$ given by the Mellin transform. ☐

The second ingredient we need to determine the Friedrichs extension is the positivity of the conormal symbols of operators bounded from below. This is standard but we provide a proof.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu} \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ be b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below. For every $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ the conormal symbol $\hat{P}_0(\sigma)$ of A is nonnegative.*

Proof. Suppose $v \in C^\infty(\partial M; E)$. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(0,1)$ be such that $\int |\phi(x)|^2 \frac{dx}{x} = 1$, and let

$$\phi_n(x) = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \phi(x^{1/n}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $\phi_n v \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ since it is smooth and supported in the interior of M. It is easy to prove that for real σ one has

$$(A(x^{i\sigma}\phi_n v), x^{i\sigma}\phi_n v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E)} \to (\hat{P}_0(\sigma)v, v)_{L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})} \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Pick c real such that $A - cI \geq 0$. The conormal symbol of $A - cI$ is then the same as that of A. Thus

$$0 \leq ((A - cI)x^{i\sigma}\phi_n v, x^{i\sigma}\phi_n v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E)} \to (\hat{P}_0(\sigma)v, v)_{L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})}.$$

□

From Lemma 6.10, the multiplicities associated to each of the points of spec(A) lying on the real line are even, and the last part of Definition 7.7 makes sense: there are well defined spaces $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A)$ for each $\sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\}$.

Theorem 8.6. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ be b-elliptic, symmetric, bounded from below, and such that P has coefficients independent of x for x small. Suppose $\sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \implies \Im\sigma = 0$ or $|\Im\sigma| > \nu/2$. Then the domain of the Friedrichs extension of A is given by*

$$\mathcal{D}_F(A) = \sum_{\substack{\Im\sigma=0 \\ \sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)}} \mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A).$$

In the situation of the theorem, the spaces $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ agree via the Mellin transform, with those defined in Proposition 6.11 since P has coefficients independent of x near the boundary.

Proof. With the hypotheses of the proposition,

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\Im\sigma=0 \\ \sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)}} \mathcal{E}_\sigma(A),$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\sigma(A)$ was defined in 7.7. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_F(A) = \mathcal{D}_F(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A),$$

a subspace of $\mathcal{E}(A)$. Passing to the Mellin transform side, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_F$ is saturated since $\mathcal{D}_F$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A)$ are κ-invariant, and selfadjoint in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(A)$ in the sense of the appendix of Section 6 since A with domain $\mathcal{D}_F$ is selfadjoint. Since $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_F$ is saturated, by Lemma 5.11 there are saturated subspaces $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,F} \subset \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j}(A)$ such that

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_F = \bigoplus_{\sigma_j\in S} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,F}.$$

Since $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_F$ is selfadjoint in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, since $[\cdot,\cdot]^\flat_A$ is nondegenerate, and since $[\hat{u},\hat{v}]^\flat_A = 0$ if $\hat{u} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j}(A)$ and $v \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_k}(A)$ with $\sigma_j \neq \sigma_k$ (Proposition 7.11), each $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,F}$ is selfadjoint in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j}$. Moreover, because A is bounded from below, $\mathcal{P} = \hat{P}_0$ is nonnegative by

Lemma 8.5, and so, by Lemma 6.10 the μ_j are even. Now Proposition 6.11 applies and we deduce

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,F} = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,\frac{1}{2}}.$$

But by definition, $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_j,\frac{1}{2}}$ is the space of elements on $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ such that $\hat{u}$ represents an element in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma_j,\frac{1}{2}}$. □

Lemma 8.7. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ be b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below, and let $P = x^\nu A$. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A) \quad \textit{for any positive } \varepsilon < \nu.$$

Proof. Note that

$$(x^{-\nu}Pv, v)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} = (Pv,v)_{L^2_b} = (x^{-\varepsilon}Pv, v)_{x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b} \tag{8.8}$$

whenever all three expressions exist. It is always true if e.g. $v \in C^\infty_c(\overset{\circ}{M};E)$. This shows, in particular, that $A = x^{-\nu}P$ is symmetric in $x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b$ if and only if $x^{-\varepsilon}P$ is symmetric in $x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b$. Suppose $\varepsilon < \nu$. Then $x^{-\varepsilon}P$ is also bounded from below because

$$x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b(M;E) \hookrightarrow x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b(M;E). \tag{8.9}$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P)$ and let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in C^\infty_c(\overset{\circ}{M};E)$ such that

$$c\|u-u_n\|^2_{x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b} + (x^{-\varepsilon}P(u-u_n), u-u_n)_{x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Then $(x^{-\nu}P(u-u_n), u-u_n)_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} = (x^{-\varepsilon}P(u-u_n), u-u_n)_{x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b} \to 0$ because of (8.8). Since also $\|u-u_n\|_{x^{-\nu/2}L^2_b} \to 0$ because $\|u-u_n\|_{x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b} \to 0$, the lemma is proved. □

Lemma 8.10. *Let $A = x^{-\nu}P$ be as in Lemma 8.7. Then P can be written as*

$$P = P_0 + xP_1$$

with P_0, $P_1 \in \operatorname{Diff}^m_b(M;E)$ such that $x^{-\nu}P_0$ is b-elliptic, symmetric, bounded from below, and has coefficients independent of x for x small.

Proof. Near the boundary ∂M, P can be written as $P = \tilde{P}_0 + x\tilde{P}_1$, where $\tilde{P}_0$ has coefficients independent of x. Let $\omega \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R})$ be equal to 1 near ∂M, define

$$P_0 = \omega\tilde{P}_0\,\omega + (1-\omega)P(1-\omega).$$

Clearly $(1-\omega)P(1-\omega)$ is symmetric and bounded from below. As the conormal symbol of P, $\mathcal{P} = \widehat{\tilde{P}}_0$ is a selfadjoint holomorphic family in the sense that $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)^* = \mathcal{P}(\overline{\sigma})$ on $H^m(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})$, and positive by Lemma 8.5. From the Mellin transform version of Plancherel's identity it follows that $\omega\tilde{P}_0\,\omega$ is also bounded from below if ω has sufficiently small support. Evidently, if the support of ω is small enough, then P_0 is elliptic in the interior and therefore b-elliptic. □

Lemma 8.11. *Let $A = x^{-\nu}P$ with $P = P_0 + xP_1$ as in Lemma 8.10. Then for $0 < \varepsilon < \nu$, $x^{-\varepsilon}P$ and $x^{-\varepsilon}P_0$ are both b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below as operators on $x^{-\varepsilon/2}L^2_b(M;E)$, and for small ε, $\mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P) = \mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P_0)$.*

The first statement follows from Lemma 8.10 and the proof of Lemma 8.7, and the equality of the Friedrichs domains is a consequence of part 4 of Proposition 4.1.

Theorem 8.12. *Let $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ be b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below. Then the domain of the Friedrichs extension of A is*

$$\mathcal{D}_F(A) = \sum_{\substack{-\nu/2<\Im\sigma<0\\ \sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)}} \mathcal{D}_\sigma(A) + \sum_{\substack{\Im\sigma=0\\ \sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)}} \mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}'_F(A)$ be the space on the right in the statement. Then A with domain $\mathcal{D}'_F(A)$ is selfadjoint, so we only need to prove that $\mathcal{D}'_F(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A)$, and we proceed to do so. Write $x^\nu A = P_0 + xP_1$ as in Lemma 8.10. From Lemmas 8.7 and 8.11 we get that if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough then $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P_0) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A)$. We may apply Theorem 8.6 to $x^{-\varepsilon}P_0$ and deduce that

$$\mathcal{D}_F(x^{-\varepsilon}P_0) = \sum_{\substack{\Im\sigma=0\\ \sigma\in\operatorname{spec}_b(A)}} \mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(x^{-\varepsilon}P_0).$$

But the intersection of this space and $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)$ is $\mathcal{D}'_F(A)$. Thus $\mathcal{D}'_F(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_F(A)$ and therefore $\mathcal{D}'_F(A) = \mathcal{D}_F(A)$. ☐

Together with Theorem 8.3 we in particular obtain

$$\mathcal{D}_F = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) \cap H_b^m(M;E) \ \text{ if and only if } \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\} = \varnothing.$$

The following corollary improving part 4 of Proposition 4.1 is an immediate consequence of the theorem, since the hypothesis implies that for $-\nu \le \Im\sigma \le 0$ the spaces $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ for both operators are equal:

Corollary 8.13. *Suppose A_0, $A_1 \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ are b-elliptic, symmetric and bounded from below. If $A_0 - A_1$ vanishes to order k, $k > \nu/2$, then $\mathcal{D}_F(A_0) = \mathcal{D}_F(A_1)$.*

9. Applications and Examples

Let $A \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M;E)$ be b-elliptic and assume that for any two distinct σ_0 and σ_1 in $\Sigma(A)$, $\Im(\sigma_0 - \sigma_1) \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Using that $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ pairs $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\sigma}_0}(A^\star)$ nonsingularly, one can extend the examples to the excluded case. Recall that $A^\star$ denotes the formal adjoint of A, and $\Sigma(A) = \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{-\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2\}$.

Example 9.1. Regard A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(A)$ for some $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(A)$. Then,

$$\mathcal{D}(A^*) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \sigma\neq\sigma_0}} \mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}}(A^\star),$$

where A^* denotes the Hilbert space adjoint of A. If there there are one or more $\sigma_j \in \Sigma(A)$ such that $\sigma_0 - \sigma_j = i\tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, then in place of the $\mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}_j}(A^\star)$ one must use certain subspaces.

Example 9.2. If A is given the domain

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma<0}} \mathcal{D}_\sigma(A),$$

then the domain of the adjoint is

$$\mathcal{D}(A^*) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma\geq 0}} \mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}}(A^\star).$$

Note that the poles of the Mellin transforms of elements in this space are on or below the real axis.

Example 9.3. Suppose $\operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ does contain points on $\Im\sigma = 0$, but that all the partial multiplicities $\mu_{\sigma_s,j}$ of each such point are even. Referring to Definition 7.7 for the notation, let A have domain

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma<0}} \mathcal{D}_\sigma(A) + \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma=0}} \mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A)$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{D}(A^*) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma>0}} \mathcal{D}_{\overline{\sigma}}(A^\star) + \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Sigma(A)\\ \Im\sigma=0}} \mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\frac{1}{2}}(A^\star).$$

Thus if A is symmetric then A with the given domain is selfadjoint. In Section 8 we proved that if A is symmetric and bounded from below then this is the domain of the Friedrichs extension.

In some cases, in particular geometric problems, one encounters operators of the form B^*B and BB^*. Below we discuss some aspects of B^*B using some of the results of this paper. The operator BB^* can be treated in the same manner.

Assume that $B \in x^{-\nu}\operatorname{Diff}_b^m(M)$ is b-elliptic, $B = x^{-\nu}Q$. Let $\mathcal{D}(B) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B)$ be such that $B : \mathcal{D}(B) \to x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M)$ is closed. Then B^*B is a selfadjoint extension of the symmetric operator $B^\star B$, considered as an unbounded operator on $x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2(M)$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{D}(B^*B) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}(B) \mid Bu \in \mathcal{D}(B^*)\}$$

Since B^* is a closed extension of the formal adjoint $B^\star$, B^*B is indeed a closed extension of $B^\star B$ with

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}(B^\star B) \subset \mathcal{D}(B^*B) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B^\star B).$$

Note that if $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B^\star B)$, then $\hat{u}$ is meromorphic in $\{\Im\sigma > -3\nu/2\}$ with poles on the strip $\{\nu/2 > \Im\sigma > -3\nu/2\}$. Write $B^\star B = x^{-2\nu}P$ with $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_b^{2m}(M)$. The conormal symbol of $B^\star B$ is then given by

$$\hat{P}_0(\sigma) = \hat{Q}_0(\overline{\sigma} - i\nu)^* \circ \hat{Q}_0(\sigma),$$

where $\hat{Q}_0(\sigma)$ is the conormal symbol of B. Thus, the boundary spectrum of $B^\star B$ contains $\operatorname{spec}_b(B)$ and its reflection with respect to $\{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2\}$ (line of symmetry). In particular, every $\sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(B^\star B) \cap \{\Im\sigma = -\nu/2\}$ has even multiplicities. For $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(B)$ define $\mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B)$ as the space of elements $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B)$ such that $Bu \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B^\star)$, and such that $\hat{u}$ is meromorphic in $\mathbb{C}$ with poles at most at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ for $\vartheta = 0, \dots, \lceil\nu\rceil$. Thus, for $\Im\sigma_0 = -\nu/2$, we have $\mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B)$.

Lemma 9.4. *If $u \in \mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B)$ and $\Im\sigma_0 = -\nu/2$, then $Bu \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B^\star)$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_0 \in \operatorname{spec}_b(B)$ be such that $\Im\sigma_0 = -\nu/2$. If $u \in \mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B)$, then $Bu \in x^{-\nu/2}L_b^2$ and $\hat{u}$ is meromorphic with poles at $\sigma_0 - i\vartheta$ for $\vartheta = 0, \dots, \lceil\nu\rceil$. It follows that $\widehat{Bu}$ is then holomorphic in $\Im\sigma > -\nu/2$ which implies $Bu \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B^\star)$. ☐

Since $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(B) \subset \mathcal{D}(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(B^\star) \subset \mathcal{D}(B^*)$, the previous lemma implies

Lemma 9.5. *If $\Im\sigma_0 = -\nu/2$ then $\mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B) \subset \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$.*

Note that $\mathcal{D}^s_{\sigma_0}(B) = \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0,\frac{1}{2}}$.

Example 9.6. If $\mathcal{D}(B) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B)$, B^*B is the Friedrichs extension of $B^\star B$ and

$$\mathcal{D}(B^*B) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B) \,|\, Bu \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B^\star)\}. \tag{9.7}$$

Denote the set on the right by $\mathcal{D}_F$. Since $\mathcal{D}(B^*B) \subset \mathcal{D}_F$, then $\mathcal{D}_F^\perp \subset \mathcal{D}(B^*B)^\perp = \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$, where $\perp$ means the orthogonal in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}(B^\star B)$ with respect to $[\cdot,\cdot]_{B^\star B}$. Now let $u \in \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$, so $Bu \in \mathcal{D}(B^*)$. Then, for every $v \in \mathcal{D}_F$

$$0 = [v, Bu]_B = (Bv, Bu) - (v, B^\star Bu) = (B^\star Bv, u) - (v, B^\star Bu) = [v, u]_{B^\star B}.$$

This implies $u \in \mathcal{D}_F^\perp$ and we get (9.7). In this case, the Mellin transform $\hat{u}$ of an element $u \in \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$ is holomorphic in $\{\Im\sigma > -\nu/2\}$ and meromorphic in $\{\Im\sigma > -3\nu/2\}$ with poles on $\{\overline{\sigma} - i\nu \,|\, \sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(B)\}$.

If $\mathcal{D}(B) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B)$, then

$$\mathcal{D}(B^*B) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}(B) \,|\, Bu \in \mathcal{D}_{\min}(B^\star)\}$$

and for $u \in \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$, $\hat{u}$ has poles at most on $\operatorname{spec}_b(B^\star) \cap \{-\nu/2 \le \Im\sigma < \nu/2\}$.

If $\mathcal{D}(B) = \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(B)$ for some $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(B) = \operatorname{spec}_b(B) \cap \{-\nu/2 < \Im\sigma < \nu/2\}$, then

$$\mathcal{D}(B^*B) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma_0}(B) \,|\, Bu \in \textstyle\sum_\sigma \mathcal{D}_\sigma(B^\star) \text{ for } \sigma \in \Sigma(B^\star),\ \sigma \neq \overline{\sigma}_0\}$$

and for $u \in \mathcal{D}(B^*B)$, $\hat{u}$ has poles at σ_0 and on $\{\overline{\sigma} - i\nu \,|\, \sigma \in \operatorname{spec}_b(B),\ \sigma \neq \sigma_0\}$.

We finish this section with some concrete examples. Assume now that, near the boundary, M is of the form $[0,1) \times S^n$ with $\partial M = \{0\} \times S^n$. Let D_y^2 be the Laplacian on S^n, let x be the variable in $[0,1)$. For $0 < \nu \le 2$ let $A = x^{-\nu}P$ with

$$P = (xD_x)^2 + a^2 D_y^2 + \beta b^2, \tag{9.8}$$

$\beta = \pm 1$ and nonnegative constants a and b. They arise, for instance, as Laplace-Beltrami operators on scalar functions associated to metrics of the form

$$g = dx^2/x^{2-\nu} + x^\nu dy^2.$$

Compare Brüning and Seeley [1], Lesch [7], and especially Mooers [11] on k-forms.

The conormal symbol of A is defined to be

$$\widehat{P}_0(\sigma) = \sigma^2 + a^2 D_y^2 + \beta b^2,$$

and the boundary spectrum $\operatorname{spec}_b(A)$ is the set of points in $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\hat{P}(\sigma)$ is not invertible. Since the set of eigenvalues of D_y^2 is $\{k(k+n-1) \,|\, k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, then

$$\operatorname{spec}_b(A) = \{\sigma \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \sigma^2 + a^2 k(k+n-1) + \beta b^2 = 0 \ \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$$

Consider $A : C_c^\infty(M) \subset x^{-\nu/2}H_b^2(M) \to x^{-\nu/2}H_b^2(M)$ as an unbounded operator. Then $\Sigma = \operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{-\nu/2 \le \Im\sigma \le \nu/2\}$ is the only set that matters when looking for the closed extensions of A. We look separately at the cases $b = 0$ and $b \neq 0$.

Example 9.9. Let $b = 0$ and $a > 0$ in (9.8). In this case, A is symmetric and bounded from below. Note that $\sigma^2 + a^2 k(k+n-1)$ has simple roots in Σ when $k \neq 0$, and a root of order 2 when $k = 0$. For illustration purposes it is enough to look at the case when $\nu = 2$ and $n = 1$. Thus $\Sigma = \{\pm ika \,|\, ka \le 1, k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. Suppose $a > 1$ so that the only point in Σ is 0. Then $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = xH_b^2(M)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \operatorname{span}\{\omega, \omega \log x\}$$

for some $\omega \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\omega(x) = 1$ near the origin.

Let $\psi_0 = \omega$ and $\psi_1 = \omega \log x$. Then,

$$\hat{\psi}_0(\sigma) = \frac{\Phi(\sigma)}{\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\psi}_1(\sigma) = \frac{\Phi(\sigma)}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\Phi'(\sigma)}{\sigma}$$

with

$$\Phi(\sigma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} x^{-i\sigma} D_x \omega(x)\, dx.$$

Let $u = u_0\psi_0 + u_1\psi_1$ and $v = v_0\psi_0 + v_1\psi_1$ be elements of $\mathcal{E}(A)$. Then, with γ a positively oriented simple closed curve in $\mathbb{C}$ surrounding 0,

$$\begin{aligned}[u,v]_A &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_\gamma \sigma^2 \hat{u}(\sigma)\overline{\hat{v}(\overline{\sigma})}\, d\sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_\gamma \Big(\frac{u_0\overline{v}_1 + u_1\overline{v}_0}{\sigma}\Big)\Phi(\sigma)\overline{\Phi(\overline{\sigma})} d\sigma \\ &= i(u_0\overline{v}_1 + u_1\overline{v}_0).\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{D}$ is a domain on which A is selfadjoint, then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \oplus \operatorname{span} u$ with some u as above such that $[u,u]_A = 0$. Thus $u_0\overline{u}_1 + u_1\overline{u}_0 = 0$ which implies $u_0\overline{u}_1 \in i\mathbb{R}$, so $\operatorname{span} u$ is one dimensional. Moreover, all selfadjoint extensions of A are of the form $A_\lambda : \mathcal{D}^\lambda \to x^{-1}H_b^2(M)$ with

$$\mathcal{D}^\lambda/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \operatorname{span}\{(e^{i\lambda}+1)\omega + (e^{i\lambda}-1)\omega\log x\}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{D}^0$ is precisely the domain of the Friedrichs extension of A. If $\frac{1}{\ell+1} < a \le \frac{1}{\ell}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\Sigma = \{\pm ika \,|\, k = 0,1,\dots,\ell\}$ and we have

$$\mathcal{D}_F(A) = \mathcal{D}^0 \oplus \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{D}_{\{-ika\}}(A).$$

Note that the partial multiplicities of the poles ika, $k \neq 0$ are equal to 1, but the total multiplicity is 2.

Example 9.10. Let $\alpha \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\alpha(0) > 1$. Then

$$A = x^{-2}\left[(xD_x)^2 + \alpha(x)^2 D_y^2\right]$$

is symmetric and bounded from below. Moreover, 0 is the only point of the boundary spectrum in $\{-1 \le \Im\sigma \le 1\}$. If $A_0 = x^{-2}[(xD_x)^2 + \alpha(0)^2 D_y^2]$, then

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\min}(A_0),\ \ \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A_0),\ \text{ and }\ \mathcal{D}_F(A) = \mathcal{D}_F(A_0).$$

Example 9.11. Let $b \neq 0$. If $\beta = 1$ in (9.8), then $A = x^{-2}P$ behaves similarly but 'nicer' than the operator in Example 9.9 since $\sigma^2 + a^2k(k+n-1) + b^2$ has only simple roots, and $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{\Im\sigma = 0\} = \varnothing$.

If $\beta = -1$, the situation is different. In this case, the conormal symbol of A

$$\hat{P}(\sigma) = \sigma^2 + a^2 D_y^2 - b^2$$

fails to be nonnegative for real σ and therefore A is not bounded from below. Moreover, $\sigma^2 + a^2k(k+n-1) - b^2$ has two simple real roots, $-b$ and b. We assume $b \le 1 < a$, so $\operatorname{spec}_b(A) \cap \{-1 \le \Im\sigma \le 1\}$ contains only $-b$ and b. Thus

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \mathcal{D}_{\max}(A)/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \operatorname{span}\{\omega x^{ib}, \omega x^{-ib}\}$$

for some $\omega \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\omega(x) = 1$ near the origin.

Let $\psi_+ = \omega x^{ib}$ and $\psi_- = \omega x^{-ib}$. Then, with Φ as above,

$$\hat{\psi}_\pm(\sigma) = \frac{\Phi(\sigma \mp b)}{\sigma \mp b}.$$

Let $u = u_+\psi_+ + u_-\psi_-$, $v = v_+\psi_+ + v_-\psi_-$. Then, with γ a positively oriented simple curve in $\mathbb{C}$ surrounding b and $-b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[u, v]_A &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_\gamma (\sigma^2 - b^2)\hat{u}(\sigma)\overline{\hat{v}(\overline{\sigma})}\, d\sigma \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_\gamma \Big\{ \left(\tfrac{\sigma+b}{\sigma-b}\right) u_+\overline{v}_+\Phi(\sigma - b)\overline{\Phi(\overline{\sigma} - b)} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \left(\tfrac{\sigma-b}{\sigma+b}\right) u_-\overline{v}_-\Phi(\sigma + b)\overline{\Phi(\overline{\sigma} + b)}\Big\} d\sigma \\
&= 2bi(u_+\overline{v}_+ - u_-\overline{v}_-)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $[u, u]_A = 2bi(|u_+|^2 - |u_-|^2)$ and if A with domain $\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) \oplus \operatorname{span} u$ is selfadjoint then $|u_+| = |u_-|$. Thus $\operatorname{span} u$ is one dimensional and all selfadjoint extensions of A are of the form $A_\lambda : \mathcal{D}^\lambda \to x^{-1}H_b^2(M)$ with

$$\mathcal{D}^\lambda/\mathcal{D}_{\min}(A) = \operatorname{span}\{\omega x^{ib} + e^{i\lambda}\omega x^{-ib}\}.$$

REFERENCES

[1] J. Brüning and R. Seeley, *Regular singular asymptotics*, Adv. in Math. **58** (1985), 133–148.

[2] ———, *An index theorem for first order regular singular operators*, Amer. J. Math. **110** (1988), 659–714.

[3] J. Cheeger, *On the spectral geometry of spaces with cone-like singularities*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **76** (1979), 2103–2106.

[4] I. C. Gohberg and E. I. Sigal, *An operator generalization of the logarithmic residue theorem and Rouché's theorem*, Math. USSR Sbornik **13** (1971), no. 4, 603–625.

[5] V.A. Kondrat'ev, *Boundary problems for elliptic equations in domains with conical or angular points*, Trans. Mosc. Math. Soc. **16** (1967), 227–313.

[6] H. Jacobowitz and G. Mendoza, *Elliptic equivalence of vector bundles*, preprint, 2000.

[7] M. Lesch, *Operators of Fuchs type, conical singularities, and asymptotic methods*, Teubner-Texte zur Math. vol 136, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart, Leipzig, 1997.

[8] R. Melrose, *Transformation of boundary value problems*, Acta Math. **147** (1981), no. 3-4, 149–236.

[9] ———, *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*, Research Notes in Mathematics, A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1993.

[10] R. Melrose and G. Mendoza, *Elliptic operators of totally characteristic type*, MSRI Preprint, 1983.

[11] E. Mooers, *Heat kernel asymptotics on manifolds with conic singularities*, J. Anal. Math. **78** (1999), 1–36.

[12] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional analysis*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1990. Translated from the second French edition by Leo F. Boron, reprint of the 1955 original.

[13] S. Coriasco, E. Schrohe, and J. Seiler, *Bounded imaginary powers of differential operators on manifolds with conical singularities*, preprint 2001 (math AP/0106008).

[14] B.-W. Schulze, *Pseudo-differential operators on manifolds with singularities*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991.

[15] ———, *Pseudo-differential boundary value problems, conical singularities, and asymptotics*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[16] J. Wloka, *Partial differential equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. Translated from the German by C. B. Thomas and M. J. Thomas.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19122